THE CLASSICAL PRIAMEL FROM HOMER TO BOETHIUS

BY

WILLIAM H. RACE

LEIDEN E. J. BRILL 1982

THE CLASSICAL PRIAMEL FROM HOMER TO BOETHIUS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · W. J. VERDENIUS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM SEPTUAGESIMUM QUARTUM

WILLIAM H. RACE

THE CLASSICAL PRIAMEL FROM HOMER TO BOETHIUS

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXXII

THE CLASSICAL PRIAMEL FROM HOMER TO BOETHIUS

BY

WILLIAM H. RACE

LEIDEN E. J. BRILL 1982

ISBN 90 04 06515 6

Copyright 1982 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

In Memory of
Elroy L. Bundy

φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων
ἄγοντα προφρόνως

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface IX

INTRODUCTION

A. The History of the Term and the Scholarship 1
B. Definitions and Criteria of the Priamel 7
C. The Relationship of the Priamel to Other Rhetorical Forms 17
  1. Comparison and Example 18
  2. Amplification 20
  3. ἀπορία (*Dubitatio*) 20
  4. *Praeteritio* or *Recusatio* 21
  5. The *Exordium* 22
  6. *Climax* 24
  7. Catalogues 24
  8. Parallelism and Repetition 27
  9. The Simile 27
  10. ἀδύνατα 28
  11. The *Gnome* 29

PART I: GREEK LITERATURE

A. Epic and Homeric Hymns 31
  1. Homer 31
  2. Hesiod 43
  3. The Homeric Hymns 43
B. Lyric Poets 54
  1. Alcman 54
  2. Archilochus 56
  3. Tyrtaeus 57
  4. Xenophanes 59
  5. Sappho 63
  6. Solon 64
  7. Theognis 67
  8. Semonides and Mimnermus 71
  9. Critias 72
  10. Pindar 73

11. Bacchylides 81
12. Timotheus 86
13. *Lyr. Frag. Adesp.* 138 (Bergk) 86

C. Tragedy 87
1. Aeschylus 87
2. Sophocles 90
3. Euripides 95

D. Hellenistic Poetry 99
1. Callimachus 99
2. Theocritus 104
3. Other Hellenistic Authors 106
4. The *Anacreontea* 108

E. Epigrams 109

F. Greek Prose 111

PART II: LATIN POETRY

A. Plautus 114

B. Catullus 115

C. Lucretius 116

D. Augustan Poetry 119
1. Vergil 119
2. Horace 122
3. Tibullus 129
4. Propertius 132
5. Ovid 141

E. Neronian Poetry 148
1. Petronius 148
2. Seneca 149
3. Persius 151

F. Flavian and Later Poetry 153
1. Martial 153
2. Juvenal 156
3. Nemesianus 156
4. Claudian 157
5. Boethius 160

Index locorum 161

PREFACE

It has been more than half a century since Franz Dornseiff introduced the term "priamel" into Classical Studies. Since then there have been two monographs and two articles (all in German) dealing with certain aspects of the subject, as well as discussions scattered throughout articles and commentaries on specific authors. Among these there is considerable inconsistency of definition and treatment. Although the existence of the priamel is well enough recognized in certain authors (e.g. Pindar, some Greek lyric poets, and Horace) there remains a general unfamiliarity with the exact nature of the form, or its importance in authors and periods not before covered. There is, then, a need for an introduction to the subject as well as a comprehensive survey of the priamel in Greek and Latin poetry. It is in such a spirit that the present study is proffered. It begins with a review of the work already done and attempts to arrive at consistent criteria for determining a priamel. It attempts to be as inclusive as possible, while discussing in detail only examples of major importance. For reasons of length, I have not treated biblical examples (whether in Hebrew or Greek), and have only referred to priamels in modern literature sparingly, and in notes.

For the benefit of the reader who may be unfamiliar with the term, perhaps this would be an appropriate place to provide a brief description. A priamel is a poetic/rhetorical form which consists, basically, of two parts: "foil" and "climax." The function of the foil is to introduce and highlight the climactic term by enumerating or summarizing a number of "other" examples, subjects, times, places, or instances, which then yield (with varying degrees of contrast or analogy) to the particular point of interest or importance. For example, at Theognis 783-788, the poet mentions his kindly reception in Sicily, Euboea, and Sparta in order to emphasize his greater enjoyment of his homeland; in the opening of *Isthmian* 7, Pindar sketches the past glories of Thebes in order to highlight the recent victory of Strepsiades; and Horace, in the introductory ode of Book I, lists various pursuits which then culminate in his own calling as a poet. But, even though the form and content may differ

from priamel to priamel, they all share a similar function: to single out one point of interest by contrast and comparison.

As for the term itself, "priamel" was unknown to ancient writers. There is no word in Greek or Latin which describes it, and no discussion in the voluminous writings on rhetoric which indicates any theoretical knowledge of it. It is, in short, an invention of the twentieth century and applied anachronistically to classical poetry and prose. The question must arise, "If the ancients themselves did not seem to know of the priamel, then of what use is it?" The easiest answer would be that (like Molière's M. Jourdain) they used priamels without knowing it, as have scores of authors in dozens of languages. Pablo Neruda would no doubt have been surprised to be told that his poem "El Miedo" is a form of priamel, as would have been Baudelaire ("Le Voyage I"), Shakespeare (*Sonnet* 91), or Horace (C. 1.1), although, surprisingly, perhaps not François Villon (e.g. "Ballade des femmes de Paris"), for the origin of the word priamel is to be found in the Middle Ages, where it described a sub-genre of poetry.

Then what is the justification for applying the word to classical authors? First is the fact that there are hundreds of them in Greek and Latin literature alone; there are few authors in whose works they are not to be found, and almost all genres manifest them. They occur as early as Homer and as late as Boethius, and, incidentally, are still being composed today. But more important than sheer number is the fact that many of the most important and memorable passages in all Greek and Latin literature are in the form of a priamel. Achilles refuses Agamemnon's gifts in a long priamel (*Il.* 9.379-391) and expresses his brooding concerns with death in another (*Il.* 9.406-409):

> ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,
> κτητοὶ δὲ τρίποδές τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα·
> ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λεϊστὴ
> οὔθ' ἑλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν ἀμείψεται ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

Sappho declares her preference of love over war in a priamel: "Some say a host of horsemen, others of infantry, and others of ships, is the most beautiful thing on the dark earth: but I say, it is what you love" (tr. Page). Pindar's First *Olympian* Ode begins with a splendid priamel: "Best is water; but gold, like fire gleaming in

the night, is preeminent among lordly possessions...." Sophocles begins his "Ode to Man" with a form of the priamel: "Many are the wonders, but none is more wonderful than man." Lucretius celebrates the tranquillity of Epicurean philosophy in a moving passage (*De Rer. Nat.* 2.1 ff.):

Suave mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis....

And in perhaps the most famous passage in Latin literature, Vergil sums up the Roman mission (*Aen.* 6.847-853):

Excudent alii spirantia mollius aera...

This sketch shows that the priamel is capable of considerable variety of form and content, and can achieve remarkable power of expression. As such, it bears greater scrutiny and attention than it has yet received.

But in the final analysis, the application of the term priamel to Greek and Latin literature will be justified (as in the case of all such technical terms) *only to the extent that it proves useful in elucidating specific contexts.* The form of the priamel must be used as a tool for interpretation. It is not enough merely to label a passage a "priamel"; one must show how the author used that form for a specific intention, and what effects are achieved thereby. In so far as it is possible, that is the goal of this study. I have attempted to view each passage *in its context* and to assess the function of the priamel, for the ultimate test of literary analysis does not lie in rigid consistency of method, but in understanding individual texts, both in their own right as well as part of a larger literary community. The priamel is important for illuminating both aspects.

Unlike any of my predecessors, upon whose work I am so greatly dependent, I have dealt with each author in more or less chronological order. This is not done in order to trace influences or development (although they are noted when appropriate), but so that each author's work might be viewed as a unit. To take but one example, Ovid's use of the priamel differs in many respects from that of previous authors, and it also changes in his own works. Furthermore, it is hoped that this arrangement might prove more useful to readers who wish to refer to a specific author.

Perhaps a word is in order concerning the inception of this undertaking. I had originally intented to write an essay of a comparative nature on the priamel in European and American literature, but

the more I examined the Greek and Roman background, the more convinced I became of its intrinsic importance, and my research grew from an introduction to the present study. Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to the College of Arts and Science of Vanderbilt University for generously giving me leave in Spring 1980 to complete this work, and to the Faculty Committee on Monograph Subvention of Vanderbilt University for financial assistance towards the cost of publication.

Nashville, Tennessee
May 1981

INTRODUCTION

A. THE HISTORY OF THE TERM AND THE SCHOLARSHIP

The origin of the term *priamel* (pronounced *pree-á-mel*) is obscure. Even its gender is disputed, although the feminine form, *die Priamel*, is the most common.[1] The name itself is a germanicized form of the Latin *praeambulum*, and it originally had nothing to do with classical poetry, but referred specifically to a minor poetic genre composed primarily in Germany from the 12th to the 16th centuries. Such *priameln* are, on the whole, short poems consisting of a series of seemingly unrelated, often paradoxical statements which are cleverly brought together at the end, usually in the final verse. Numerous collections of priamels survive, and the author who is most noted in the genre is the 15th century Nuremberg poet, Hans Rosenplüt.[2]

Although the bulk of examples in the Medieval period comes from German literature, the *form itself* (a series of examples supporting a "point") is so basic to all writing that scholars have been tempted to see in it a universal phenomenon. The first such study is F. G. Bergmann's *La Priamèle dans les Différentes Littératures Anciennes et Modernes* (Strasbourg 1868). The breadth and usefulness of this work is greatly diminished because the author restricts priamels to one particular type found in didactic literature. This special type is illustrated by *Proverbs* 30.21-23:

> Under three things the earth trembles;
> under four it cannot bear up:

---

[1] K. Euling, *Das Priamel bis Hans Rosenplüt*, *Germ. Abh. hsg. von Weinhold und Vogt* 25, (Breslau 1905) and "Priamel," *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, II (1926-28) 723-725 argued for and used the neuter gender, but the feminine has prevailed.

[2] Besides the works of K. Euling (above, note 1), which are standard, cf. W. Uhl, *Die deutsche Priamel und ihre Entstehung und Ausbildung* (Leipzig 1897), C. Selmer and C. R. Goedsche, "The Priamel Manuscript of the Newberry Library, Chicago," PMLA 53 (1938) 64-77, and B. Q. Morgan, "Priamel," *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, A. Preminger, ed., (Princeton 1965) 663. For the relationship with proverbs, cf. A. Taylor, *The Proverb* (Harvard 1931) 179-180.

a slave when he becomes king,
and a fool when he is filled with food;

an unloved woman when she gets a husband,
and a maid when she succeeds her mistress.

With such a limited notion of the priamel, it is not surprising that he finds no examples (except two pieces from the *Anacreontea*) in all of Greek and Latin literature.[3]

In his 1905 article "Elegie," RE V 2, Coll. 2260-2307, O. Crusius noted "priamelartig" features in Tyrtaeus 9.1 ff. (2269 f.), Ovid's *Tristia* 1.8, 4.6, and 5.2 (2304), and in later Latin elegy (2307).

Perhaps taking a cue from Crusius, Dornseiff was the first (1921) to use the term *priamel* systematically in Classical Studies. In order to describe a frequent phenomenon in Pindar's poetry, he showed that such passages as the opening of *Olympian* 1 ("Best is water; but gold, like fire gleaming in the night...") and *Olympian* 11 ("There is a time when men most need wind...") could conveniently be understood as variations of the priamel and related to many other examples in Pindar (e.g. P. 1.75-80, 99-100, I. 5.30-35), in Bacchylides (3.85 ff.), in Sappho (*fr.* 16.1-4), in Aeschylus (*Choe.* 585 ff.), in Sophocles (*Ant.* 332 ff.), and in Roman poetry.[4] In 1933, Dornseiff extended his research into the priamel to include passages in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* (e.g. 19-25 and 140-146),[5] Pindar (P. 2.13 ff.)[6] and Alcman *fr.* 1.[7]

---

[3] Bergmann's study is also limited by his determination to seek the origin of this particular type in Indian literature (later transmitted through Hebrew wisdom literature). Concerning the Greeks, he says (p. 19): "La méthode de la philosophie morale des sophistes et de Socrate, reposant sur l'analyse et la dialectique, ne comportait pas non plus l'exposition synthétique d'une proposition générale. La Priamèle n'avait donc pas de chances de se faire adopter dans la poésie didactique des Grecs. Cependant cette forme se serait produite facilement, si les sept Sages avaient eu l'esprit assez synthétique pour résumer plusieurs de leurs sentences dans une proposition générale: si *Chilon*, par example, avait dit:

Qu'y a-t-il de plus difficile?
Se connaître soi-même—
Garder un secret—
Supporter le malheur—
Se contenter de son sort, etc."

[4] F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin 1921) 97-102. H. Fränkel, "Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur," NGG (1924) 94-95, 120-121 noted the form and added further examples from Pindar, Sophocles, Timocreon, and Horace.

[5] F. Dornseiff, *Die archaische Mythenerzählung* (Berlin/Leipzig 1933) 3-12, 78-82.

[6] F. Dornseiff, "Review of L. Illig: *Die Form der pindarischen Erzählung*," *Gnomon* 9 (1933) 272.

[7] F. Dornseiff, "Alkmans Mädchenlied für Orthia," *Antike* 9 (1933) 128-129.

In 1935, Dornseiff's student W. Kröhling produced what remains the only comprehensive study of the priamel in Greek and Latin poetry.[8] It is especially valuable as a reference for examples, of which he notes some 380. Although his list is far from complete (as he himself notes), and a good number of his examples are disputable, the following figures taken from his index will give an indication of how widespread the form is, especially in Latin poetry, where relatively little notice has been taken of it: Pindar (29 examples), Theognis (6), the Greek Anthology (20), Vergil (13), Horace (23), Tibullus (12), Propertius (20), Martial (48), and Ovid (101).

There are two main weaknesses in Kröhling's work. First, his definition of priamel is quite vague, and many examples are listed which have only marginal relevance, if any. The second weakness lies in the presentation. The priamels are arranged according to content into some twenty topics, including such categories as "der Anzahl," "der Zeitdauer," "Werte an Besitz," "Werte am Menschen," "Zugehörigkeit," and three large groups "Priameln mit Sentenzen," "Priameln mit Erfahrungstatsachen," and "Verschiedenes." The large number of examples in the last three categories shows how unsatisfactory these classifications by content are: the material contained in priamels is simply too diverse to permit systematic arrangement. Another problem in Kröhling's presentation is the complete disregard of the context and function of his examples.

In 1940, W. A. A. Van Otterlo published an article on priamels in Greek poetry, in which he added several new examples.[9] His discussion is, however, very uneven (if not haphazard at times), and the rationale of his various groupings is not always clear. On the other hand, of particular note is his tracing of several forms to Homeric models.

Although the form of the priamel was noted by E. Fraenkel[10] and E. R. Dodds[11] concerning particular instances in Greek drama, the priamel has become a familiar term of analysis in Pindaric studies

---

[8] W. Kröhling, *Die Priamel (Beispielreihung) als Stilmittel in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung*; nebst einem Nachwort: *Die altorientalische Priamel* von Franz Dornseiff, *Greifswalder Beiträge* 10 (Greifswald 1935).

[9] W. A. A. Van Otterlo, "Beitrag zur Kenntnis der griechischen Priamel," *Mnemosyne* 3,8 (1940) 145-176.

[10] E. Fraenkel, *Agamemnon* II (Oxford 1950) 407-408 n. 3.

[11] E. R. Dodds, *Bacchae*^{2} (Oxford 1960) 190, *ad vv.* 902-911.

since the publication of E. L. Bundy's *Studia Pindarica* in 1962.[12] In order to discuss the extremely complex use of "foil" and "climax" in Pindar and Bacchylides, Bundy drew on Dornseiff's and Kröhling's studies, but refined and expanded their work in ways which will be discussed later.

In 1964, U. Schmid published a monograph (based on his 1960 Tübingen dissertation) on one form of the priamel, the so-called "Priamel der Werte."[13] These priamels consist of a list of commonly valued attributes (such as wealth, strength, athletic ability, etc.), which are then opposed by the author's own preference. A model of this type is Tyrtaeus 12W, which contrasts athletic prowess (2), strength (3), beauty (5), wealth (6), political power (7), and eloquence (8) with "furious valor" (9).

For the purpose of analysis, Schmid divides these *Wertpriameln* into four groups having formal affinities. The first group[14] is differentiated by its polemical intention, whereby the poet seeks to challenge the traditional values of others with his own *Höchstwert.* The priamels in this group are *zweipolig,* which means that the author opposes his standard to that of "others" (ἀνήρ, Tyrt. 12.1W; τις, Xenophanes 2.1W; πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων, Theogn. 699; and τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν, Plato, *Laws* 661a4). In contrast, the priamels of the second group[15] are *einpolig.* They simply state the preference of the author without referring to the values of other persons or groups. Formally this group is characterized by the antithesis οὐκ-ἀλλά. The third group[16] is formally distinguished by the opposition between the author's choice and the *opinions* of others, as in the famous example from Sappho *fr.* 16: οἱ μὲν

---

[12] E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica I* and *II*, *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 18 (Berkeley 1962). Bundy continues his discussion of priamels throughout his later "The 'Quarrel Between Kallimachos and Apollonios' Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*," CSCA 5 (1972) 39-94. These works will subsequently be referred to as Bundy (1962) and (1972).

[13] U. Schmid, *Die Priamel der Werte im Griechischen von Homer bis Paulus* (Wiesbaden 1964).

[14] Tyrtaeus 12W, *Il.* 9.379-387, Xenophanes 2W, Theognis 699-718, and Plato, *Laws* 660e-661c5.

[15] *Od.* 14.222-228, Archilochus 60D, [Theocritus] 8.53-56, Eur. *Medea* 542-544, Callimachus, *Aetia* 3, fr. 75.44-49, and Herodotus 8.144.1.

[16] *Il.* 13.726-735, Sappho *fr.* 16 L.-P., Pindar N. 8.37-39, Timocreon of Rhodes 1, Thucydides 1.86.3, Pindar *fr.* 221 S.-M., Eur. *fr.* 660 N, Horace C. 1.1, 1.7, 1.31, 2.18, 3.1, and 4.3, Tibullus 1.1 (and a number of other passages), and Synesius *Hymn* 9.1-44. This list contains some examples from Tibullus which are not considered priamels in this study.

ἱππήων.... The fourth category[17] comprises examples that are entirely anonymous, where the opinions of others and of the "I" of the author are lacking.

There is much of value of Schmid's close analysis and comparison of individual examples, in his beginning with Homeric models, and in his treatment of Horace. There are, however, two major limitations. First, his four categories may be of some value in organizing his presentation of the material, but they are extremely artificial, and are of little value when dealing with priamels in general. Second, his study narrowly focuses on one type of priamel, and even then there are significant omissions.[18] A wealth of relevant material is not dealt with, and some of his additional examples (e.g. Horace C. 3.1, Tibullus 1.1.53 ff., 1.9.31 ff., and Theognis 255-256) are questionable.

Worthy of notice is the 1970 commentary on Horace, *Odes Book I* by Nisbet and Hubbard. They take note of the work done on the priamel when dealing with C. 1.1, 1.7, and 1.31, and add further examples as well.[19]

In 1974 T. Krischer published an article which briefly reviews the literature on the priamel and attempts to arrive at a new system of classifications based on the logical structure, rather than on content (Kröhling), the differences of one type (Schmid), or the particular use in one author (Bundy).[20] Instead, he divides priamels into three main groups: "focusing," "contrasting," and "generalizing."

The "specifizierende" priamel corresponds to Bundy's "focusing" priamel and is characteristic of the prooimia of many of Pindar's odes (e.g. O. 11, O. 12, O. 14, N. 7, N. 8, and I. 5). Here the movement is from the general context to the particular subject of interest, which is a part of the larger whole. In the "kontrastierende" or "antithetische" priamel the relationship is not that of part to whole, but a contrast. This type is further divided into "relativierende" priamels, where a complete contrast (or rejection) is not implied, but a sort of "balance" is maintained, as in Horace

[17] The Delian inscription (= Theogn. 255-256) and 1 *Esdras* 4.34-41.

[18] T. Krischer, "Die logischen Formen der Priamel," GB 2 (1974) 79-91 questions the appropriateness of Schmid's second priamel group (as well as two of its examples), and notes the omission of Pindar *Olympian* 1.1 ff.

[19] R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I* (Oxford 1970) 2-3, 92, 94-95, 348.

[20] Krischer (above, note 18).

C. 1.7, where Tibur (Horace's preference) takes its place among the noted places of song; and the "verabsolutierende" priamels (by far the most important group), where the choice of the author overrides or opposes the others. The third group consists of "generalisierende" priamels, where a series of examples is adduced (as in an inductive syllogism) to make a logical conclusion: A, B, and C do it; (therefore) so should I.[21]

With the exception of the "relativierende" priamels,[22] these are useful categories insofar as they describe the relationship between the "foil" and the "climax" as basically that of universal to particular ("focusing" and "generalizing") or "contrast." The great problem with such a system is that individual priamels are often much more complex than these categories. For example, a focusing priamel often involves a contrast as well, as in the case of Tyrtaeus 12W, where out of the general category of ἀρετή one emerges—in contrast—as best. Similarly, it is often difficult to determine (as in Solon *fr.* 9W) whether the priamel involves an analogy ("generalisierende") or a contrast ("kontrastierende"), or both in various degrees. Finally, all three aspects are present in some measure in all priamels: 1) focusing, in that each arrives at a point to be made; 2) contrasting, in that the point stands out from the other examples; 3) generalizing, in that the examples must bear a general relationship with the point itself. For our purposes, it is best

---

[21] He gives as examples of this last type Soph. *Ajax* 669-676, *Il.* 5.382 ff., A.P. 9.363, and Lysias 19.45 ff., and notes that it generally occurs in hortatory contexts, especially in the orators. It should be added that it is also at home in Latin elegiac poetry, when the poet adopts the didactic posture of a *praeceptor amoris*.

[22] Krischer (above, note 18) 84-85, only gives one example of this "relativierende" priamel, Horace C. 1.7, about which he says: "Horaz will in c. 1.7 weder Rhodos noch Mytilene herabsetzen, sondern er will nur sein (scheinbar unbedeutendes) Tibur aufwerten." To imagine that Horace merely wishes to raise the status of Tiber to that of the other cities is to take a very narrow view of the *contrast* between the great Greek cities and the small Roman Tibur, and to neglect entirely Horace's explicit *preference* for the latter (*me nec tam* ... *percussit* ... *quam*, 10-12) over Lacedaemon and Larissa (and by extension, over the rest). On Krischer's view, Horace would be saying, "I like Rhodes, Mytilene, etc., and Tibur just as well," when in fact he dismisses them with *laudabunt alii*. A comparison with other Horatian priamels (e.g. 2.6.1-8 and 4.3.1-12) shows that Tibur is in fact preferred. This exemplifies the kinds of distortions which result from trying to make texts fit abstract schemes. What lies, I think, behind Krischer's subcategory "relativierende" is the insight that not all priamels present a stark black and white contrast, but that there are degrees of balance and parity. An example of such "balance" can be found at Prop. 2.34.85-94, when the poet hopes that he and Cynthia will join the company of famous Latin love poets and their mistresses.

to subsume all three in the definition of the priamel's function: *to single out one point of interest by contrast and comparison.* The emphasis which each of these elements receives differs from priamel to priamel.

B. DEFINITIONS AND CRITERIA OF THE PRIAMEL

As in the case of all complex and interrelated phenomena, especially in poetics and rhetoric, where one form often shades into another, it is impossible to give a completely adequate definition of the priamel. If the definition is broad enough to embrace all the manifestations, then it will include as well forms which might better be described in other terms. On the other hand, if the definition is too narrow, the gain in consistency is offset by the exclusion of many related examples, and its usefulness is severely restricted. As a starting point, we shall examine some of the previous definitions of the priamel. Then we shall present our own criteria.

Bergmann (*supra*, p. 1) gives the following definition (7):

> La Priamèle consiste en une énumération ou indication explicite de faits plus ou moins nombreux ayant de l'analogie entre eux, et aboutissant à une proposition générale qui les résume ou qui résulte de leur énumération.

When the *proposition générale* (also called *le Dit*, *le Proverbe*, *la Sentence*) comes at the beginning, it is *analytical*, as in the following French example (34):

Dieu me garde de quatre maisons:
De la Taverne, du Lombard,
De l'Hôpital, et de la Prison.

When it comes at the end, it is called *synthetic*, as here (34):

Femme, Feu, Messe, Vent et Mer,
Font cinq maux de grand amer.

Bergmann's general definition recognizes that a priamel contains both particular and general elements, but because of his restriction to examples from didactic literature with an explicit gnome (almost exclusively in the form of a "Zahlenspruch"), his work contains little of general use.[23]

---

[23] Surprisingly, however, Bergmann cites Byron's *Don Juan* I 122-127 as the only example of a priamel in English. Byron's passage is a greatly expanded imitation of Lucretius 2.1 ff., which culminates with:

In applying the concept of the priamel to Greek poetry, F. Dornseiff broadened considerably its definition:[24]

> Unter Priamel verstehe ich eine volkstümliche, international verbreitete Form von Beispielreihung, die in der griechischen hohen Poesie, besonders in der Chorlyrik, sehr beliebt ist. Meistens erscheint die Beispielreihe, ohne daß die Wahrheit, die sie beleuchten soll, ausgesprochen wird, als Vorauslauf (praeambulum, daraus Priamel) für eine Schlußpointe.... Es kommt aber auch vor, daß der allgemeine Satz, der mit der Beispielreihe belegt werden soll, am Anfang ausgesprochen ist.... Oder daß der Schlußsatz gnomisch ist.

And, further, in discussing the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*, he pointed out that in choral lyric a particular function of the priamel is to select a theme, which is given preference over a series of others. As such it readily occurs in the introduction of a poem (as a kind of *praeteritio*) and also in transitions.[25] Thus, Dornseiff has broadened Bergmann's conception of the priamel in the following important ways: 1) the *proposition générale* need not be stated, 2) the content is no longer strictly didactic, and 3) the form can serve a poetic function in a larger work, rather than being simply a self-contained, epigrammatic proverb. Dornseiff has, however, maintained the concept of what Bergmann calls "analytic" priamels, where a list of examples follows a gnome. The validity of calling these priamels will be decided later.

In summing up his monograph on the priamel, W. Kröhling says:[26]

But sweeter still than this, than these, than all,
Is first and passionate love...

It is odd, then, that Bergmann did not consider the passage of Lucretius also to be a priamel.

[24] F. Dornseiff (above, note 5) 3. He cites Soph. *Ant.* 332 as an example of *der allgemeine Satz* followed by a list of examples. Also of note is the word *volkstümliche*, which occurs often in discussions of the Medieval German priameln. The word is inappropriate when it comes to the classical priamel; in Greek and Latin literature it is consistently used as a sophisticated device, and nowhere betrays any "folk" origins.

[25] *Ibid.*, 4. The relationship of the priamel and *praeteritio* is discussed *infra* p. 21.

[26] W. Kröhling (above, note 8) 73. He goes on to add: "Die Priamel soll erläutern, verdeutlichen, anschaulich machen, auf etwas besonders eindrucksvoll hinweisen, Spannung erregen." This "tension" is an important aspect of the intellectual and emotional power of the priamel, and a function of the sense of "closure" experienced when a just balance between the universal and particular is achieved, or when the end of a search (ζήτησις) is reached.

> The purpose and effect of the priamel is always to make something stand out (*Hervorhebung*), whether to praise, to censure, or to clarify. Sometimes a priamel makes a thing, an event, or a fact stand out from a wider background (*Hintergrund*); sometimes it illustrates the force of a generalization with a list of examples.

The analogy drawn from painting of a "background" and "foreground" is quite helpful in describing the effect of a priamel, as is the concept of "foil" used by Dornseiff and later by Bundy. Throughout his work, Kröhling follows his predecessors in allowing a priamel to consist of a gnome followed by a list.

It is worthwhile to examine as well three other definitions, which are very similar, but which all too narrowly define the term:[27]

1) E. Fraenkel: "a series of detached statements which through contrast or comparison lead up to the idea with which the speaker is primarily concerned."
2) E. R. Dodds: "a series of detached statements illustrating either by analogy or by contrast a rule of wisdom in which the passage culminates."
3) M. L. West: "the figure in which a series of three (occasionally more) paratactic statements of similar form serves to emphasize the last."

Dornseiff's and Kröhling's *Beispielreihung* has been narrowed to "a series of detached/paratactic statements," which West further specifies as "of similar form." There is no reason that a priamel must consist of *detached statements* (they often consist of lists), and the form is often varied to good purpose; nor does a priamel always lead up to an "idea" or to a "rule of wisdom." But these definitions are important for pointing out that a priamel operates in terms of contrast and comparison, and that it "leads up to," "culminates in," "emphasizes" the last element.

The last definition to be considered is that of E. L. Bundy. It is the most general, and the one (with the qualification discussed below) which serves as the basis of this study. "The priamel is a focusing or selecting device in which one or more terms serve as foil

---

[27] E. Fraenkel (above, note 10); E. R. Dodds (above, note 11); and M. L. West, *Hesiod*, *Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 269 *ad vv.* 435-436. It is, of course, understood that these three "definitions" are tailored to suit the context they are meant to explain, and that they were not intended to serve as all-embracing definitions.

for the point of particular interest."[28] By the words "focusing," "selecting," and "foil," Bundy is using other metaphors to describe the ability of the priamel to sketch a background and "highlight" or "emphasize" a particular item, which we have seen present in all the definitions so far. What is different about Bundy's definition is suggested in the words *one or more terms*, and in this respect there are two separate issues. First, in discussing the use of foil in Pindar's poetry, he notes that Pindar frequently uses one item as a contrast for the point of interest—what Dornseiff had called *der Vergleich ohne wie*[29]—which he calls a "two-term" or "abbreviated" priamel. An example is the opening of N. 4, where festivity (εὐφροσύνα, 1) is contrasted (adversative δέ, 2) with song (ἀοιδαί, 3). Other examples include the opening of O. 6, O. 7, and the end of O. 10. Bundy is correct in seeing this as a form related to the priamel, and it is useful to discuss it as such in the context of Pindar's poetry, but it finds little use outside of choral lyric, and can be adequately described with the more familiar terms of simile or simple contrast. For our purposes, the form of the priamel is distinguished by the comparison (or contrast) of more than two items.

The other innovation of Bundy, and far the more important outside of Pindar's poetry, is his recognition that a priamel need not always provide a full-scale list, but can accomplish the same effect by means of summary expressions. This he calls a "summary" priamel, and the foil terms include summary statements indicating quantity (usually forms of πᾶς or πολύς) or variety (e.g. ἄλλος, or ἕτερος). A detailed comparison of three Pindaric examples will help to establish the "summary priamel" as a valid form and clarify its relationship to a priamel containing a list. These examples can then in turn serve to illustrate the five elements discussed below.

N. 3.6-8

διψῇ δὲ πρᾶγος ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου,
ἀεθλονικία δὲ μάλιστ' ἀοιδὰν φιλεῖ,
στεφάνων ἀρετᾶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν·

---

[28] E. L. Bundy (1962) 5.

[29] F. Dornseiff (above, note 4) 97, and cf. W. Kröhling (above, note 8) 16-18.

I. 1.47-51

μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις
γλυκύς,
μηλοβότᾳ τ' ἀρότᾳ τ' ὀρ-
νιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὃν πόντος τράφει.
γαστρὶ δὲ πᾶς τις ἀμύνων λιμὸν αἰανῆ τέταται·
ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἁβρόν,
εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολια-
τᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον.

O. 11.1-6

Ἔστιν ἀνθρώποις ἀνέμων ὅτε πλεῖστα
χρῆσις· ἔστιν δ' οὐρανίων ὑδάτων,
ὀμβρίων παίδων νεφέλας·
εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνῳ τις εὖ πράσσοι, μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι
ὑστέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων
τέλλεται καὶ πιστὸν ὅρκιον μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς·

The function of all three passages is the same: to introduce song as the meed of achievement. The first and third occur at the beginning of their odes; the second at the end, when the poet is reintroducing the victor for final praise. Thus, all indicate the special virtue of the priamel (= *praeambulum*) to introduce a subject, either at the beginning, or in transition. In the first passage (N. 3.6-7) there is no *Beispielreihung*; only the general statement that different actions crave (διψῇ, 6) different things. Then, without further specification, the category of athletics with its love (φιλεῖ, 7) for song is singled out. One might object to calling this a priamel by saying that there is nothing more here than a simple contrast between ἄλλο μέν (6) and ἀεθλονικία δέ (7).[30] There is indeed a contrast, but not between two specific items; rather, the contrast is between a multiplicity of possibilities in the general realm of action (πρᾶγος, 6), and the specific category of athletic victory (ἀεθλονικία, 7). The movement is from general to particular, from genus to species. That the phrase ἄλλο... ἄλλου (6) could be expanded with illustrative examples, if the poet desired, is clearly shown by the two following examples.

At I. 1.47, the poet begins a priamel with a statement which is a slight variation of that at N. 3.6,[31] but instead of proceeding direct-

---

[30] T. Krischer (above, note 18) 80 mentions Bundy's "summary priamel," but leaves open the question as to whether or not it should really be called a priamel.

[31] διψῇ corresponds to γλυκύς (ἐστι); πρᾶγος corresponds to ἔργμασιν; and ἄλλο...ἄλλου to ἄλλοις ἄλλος. Cf. the same form at *Il.* 2.400-403.

ly to athletic achievement, he lists examples of some activities which seek reward: the shepherd, the plowman, the fowler, and the fisherman. The priamel is not yet complete, for, in spite of the list,[32] we have not yet singled out the category of ultimate interest, which is to be athletic victory. It is obvious that athletics, while sharing in its need for reward (μισθός, 47; κέρδος, 51) a general resemblance to the listed activities, is a very different sort of thing, and would awkwardly fit at the end of a list consisting of shepherds and the like. Thus, the poet groups them together as one general category in verse 49,[33] so that the list might be contrasted *en masse* with the new category (ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις, 50) in the sphere of *action*,[34] with its μισθὸς γλυκύς (47) = κέρδος ὕψιστον (51).[35] Thus, both N. 3.6-8 and I. 1.47-51 have the function of providing a background out of which emerges (*Hervorhebung*) athletic victory and its need for song. The first does so in summary fashion, the second elaborates with a list; the two types are so closely related in form and in function that it is useful to distinguish a sub-species of "summary" priamel.[36]

The opening of O. 11 provides yet another variation on the same theme and form. Instead of a general statement such as those in the

---

[32] This passage demonstrates the inadequacy of West's formulation of a priamel as "the figure in which a series of three (occasionally more) paratactic statements of similar form serves to emphasize the last" (above, note 27).

[33] The key word (delayed until the last for greater effect) is τράφει (48), which links them all together as aspects of "sustenance." This group of four (shepherd, plowman, fowler, and fisherman), which universalizes all sources of nourishment (land, air, sea; grazing and planting), is very old. The four occur together in a text from Nippur. Cf. T. Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven 1976) 32, who paraphrases the text found at S. N. Kramer, *Sumerian Literary Texts from Nippur, Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 23 (New Haven 1944) no. 35. The universalizing effect is continued in the next line with πᾶς τις.

[34] Whereas everyone (πᾶς τις, 49) is subject to the human condition and needs continual nourishment, some individuals win renown in the realm of action (athletics and war). Pindar has very carefully chosen these categories. On the interrelationship between labor (cf. τέταται, 49), action (cf. ἀέθλοις, 50), and poetry (implied in κῦδος, 50; εὐαγορηθείς, 51; and γλώσσας ἄωτον, 51), cf. H. Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago 1958) 93-101.

[35] Note in the climax (50-51) the adversative δέ, the new category ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις, the superlative ὕψιστον, and the elaboration (ἐπιμονή). All of these are, as will become clear, standard signals of the climax of a priamel. Pindar does not yet wish to be too specific (he is withholding mention of Herodotus for climactic effect), and so he employs ὅς (50) and leaves open the category of πολεμίζων (50). Incidentally, if the Asopodorus at Hdt. 9.69 is indeed the father of Herodotus of Thebes, then πολεμίζων is not entirely gratuitous.

[36] Cf. P. 2.13-20, where a summary priamel is followed by just one example before the climax.

previous two examples, to the effect that "men have different compelling needs (πλεῖστα/χρῆσις, 1-2) at a particular time (ὅτε, 1)," he begins with two examples from nature: wind and rain, and the general proposition must be inferred from the examples. Since both examples are from the natural realm, the poet can then contrast them with the realm of action: εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνῳ τις εὖ πράσσοι (4), and its need for song.

These three passages with similar content and rhetorical purpose illustrate how the priamel can be varied and expanded from summary statements to multiple examples. It is not the list (*Beispielreihung*) which is essential, though it very often appears, but sometimes the mere indication of quantity or diversity carries the force of a list, which the poet in a given context can expand if he so wishes.

We shall examine more examples of the summary priamel when we deal with Homer, but there is one further example which we shall use to demonstrate what we consider to be the essential features of the priamel. Sophocles opens his "Ode to Man" with a summary priamel (*Ant.* 332):

πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου δεινότερον πέλει·

There are five things to note:

1) a general context or category (τὰ δεινά)
2) an indication of quantity (elsewhere diversity) (πολλά)
3) a capping particle (καί)[37]
4) an indication of relative merit (οὐδὲν ... δεινότερον)
5) the subject of ultimate interest (ἀνθρώπου)

Each of these elements can be subject to considerable variation. 1) The general context is sometimes clearly indicated, as in the examples from Pindar (N. 3.6: διψῇ ... πρᾶγος: achievement and its needs; I. 1.47: μισθός: reward; O. 11.2: χρῆσις: men's needs). Sometimes it must be inferred from the examples, or from the context in which it occurs.

---

[37] The καί followed by οὐδέν is here adversative. Cf. Kühner-Gerth 2.248.4 and Smyth 2871. It has the same meaning in this priamel (Anonymous, Page, LP no. 147.5-6, p. 606):

Ὀρφείηι καὶ πρόσθεν ὑπείκαθε πόντ[ος ἀοιδῆι,
καὶ θῆρες θέλγοντο, *καὶ* οὐ θέλγοντο [γυναῖκες.

2) Quantity or diversity can be indicated in summary form (as N. 3.6: ἄλλο...ἄλλου; I. 1.47: ἄλλοις ἄλλος), or it can be portrayed through a list (i.e. two or more) of particular examples (O. 11.1-2: need for wind, need for rain). In the case of I. 1.47-48 the two are combined.[38]

3) The cardinal point in a priamel at which the background (*Hintergrund*, general context, foil) gives way to (focuses on, culminates in) the point of interest (*Schlußpointe*, cap) manifests considerable variety depending upon the particular relationship between the two parts (i.e. the various degrees of contrast or analogy between them). In Greek this relationship is frequently defined with a particle (or adversative asyndeton), as in the examples from Pindar (N. 3.7: δέ; I. 1.50: δέ; O. 11.4: δέ).[39] In Latin, where there are fewer particles (although *sed*, *at*, and *tamen* frequently appear), adversative asyndeton is very common. In both languages there is a marked tendency to place key words at the head of (or in prominent position in)[40] the statement which forms the climax (N. 3:7: ἀεθλονικία; I. 1.50: ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις).[41] There are other important signals of a climax: 1) a change of person,[42] 2) a change of syntax,[43]

---

[38] Cf. Aesch. *Choe.* 585 ff., where πολλὰ ... δεινά are expanded into a list.

[39] ἀλλά is very commonly used to mark the preceding material (often introduced with οὐ) as foil, and to introduce the climax. Cf. Bundy (1962) 22 n. 50 and 36 n. 3. ἀλλά clearly exhibits the "cardinal" function of *both* dismissing previous material *and* emphasizing the coming climax. καί (copulative) and Latin *et* and *quoque* are also frequently used, and the sense of climax is reinforced by one or more of the signals listed below.

[40] The key positions in the climax are first of all at the head of the statement, where the shifts of subject, person, etc. take place and where contrasts are most strongly marked. But secondly, the name of the subject or a significant attribute may be withheld until the end of the statement in order to create expectation and a further sense of climax. In the examples cited from Pindar, there is a subtle emphasis (reinforced by the rhythm) on ἀρετᾶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν (N. 3.8), γλώσσας ἄωτον (I. 1.51) and μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς (O. 11.6); in other examples (e.g. O. 1.3-7) this withholding is much more deliberate and effective.

[41] The emphasis which σὺν πόνῳ at O. 11.4 naturally receives at the head of the climactic statement indicates that Pindar is contrasting those times when men are dependent upon external things (wind and rain) with those times when it is *through his own effort* that he succeeds. And then, of course, after his success, he is once again dependent upon external support to commemorate his deeds.

[42] The shift of person, most frequently to the first person (e.g. ἐγὼ δέ, *me*) or second person (e.g. σοί, *te*) is one of the most important indicators of a climax. Because it occurs so frequently, Bundy labeled it a "pronominal cap"; cf. Bundy (1962) 5 n. 18. Also included are shifts in pronominal adjectives (e.g. ἡμέτερος, *meus*). Cf. also the third personal pronouns ὅς (I. 1.50) and τις (O. 11.4).

[43] A change of syntax often helps set off the climax from the foil, as εἰ δέ at

3) a change of subject,[44] 4) a change of mood,[45] 5) vocatives,[46] 6) deictic words.[47]

4) An indication of relative merit is the only one of the five elements which is not indispensable, but it occurs so frequently that it is worth noting. It is one of the ways in which prominence is given to the climactic term.[48] A superlative in one form or another frequently singles out or raises the item of interest above the rest. In the example from *Ant.* 332, οὐδὲν δεινότερον is *litotes* for δεινότατον, and in the Pindaric examples, cf. μάλιστα (N. 3.7), δεξιωτάταν (N. 3.8), and ὕφιστον (I. 1.51).[49]

5) Once the subject of ultimate interest has been arrived at, highlighted as it were, then the author is free to elaborate on it if he wishes, or, having made his point, he may pass on. But there must be some *point* to the priamel. Not just any list constitutes a priamel; it must lead up to something. For that reason, in opposition to Bergmann, Dornseiff, and Kröhling, I am excluding from consideration those lists of examples which simply follow a general statement to justify it and do not lead up to anything. Such lists are remotely related to the priamel (and in this study I stress its role as

---

O. 11.4 (cf. O. 1.3). Interrogatives are also frequent, usually rhetorical questions such as τίς; (= οὐδείς) or πῶς οὔ;

[44] Naturally a change of subject, usually prominently displayed in the climax, can signal a climax, especially when it contrasts logically with the preceding terms. After all, the purpose of most priamels is to highlight one thing, so it is obvious that a change of subject must take place in the climax. Cf. ἀεθλονικία at N. 3.7. Also frequent, especially in encomia, is the appearance of a proper name. Bundy (1962) 5 n. 18 termed this a "name cap."

[45] The most common change of mood is an imperative. Cf. e.g. Catullus 11.15, Vergil *Aen.* 6.851, and Horace *Epis.* 1.2.67. This change also has the advantage of being reinforced by a change of person, and sometimes a vocative as well. Also included in this category are expressions which are virtual imperatives, such as χρή, πρέπει, δεῖ, etc. or Latin subjunctives (e.g. Tib. 2.3.47).

[46] Vocatives are obvious indicators of a climax, whether or not accompanied by an imperative. Cf. e.g. *h. Hom.* 3.146 and Vergil *Georg.* 2.170.

[47] Last, and very important, are deictic pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs, for they literally "point to" the climactic term. ὅδε, *hic*, ἐκεῖνος, *ille*, νῦν, and *nunc* are very frequent. Cf. e.g. *Il.* 2.274 and Lucretius 1.729.

[48] On superlatives in Pindaric priamels, cf. Bundy (1962) 11 n. 33 and 67. Such evaluative terms indicate the ability of the priamel to establish a scale or hierarchy of value, and behind such priamels as Sappho *fr.* 16.1-4 and Pindar O. 1.1-7 are the questions τί κάλλιστον; τί ἄριστον;

[49] Although the superlative in the climax of a priamel generally serves to grant superiority to the climactic term over the foil terms, it can also, as in these Pindaric examples, simply serve as αὔξησις, to give added weight and a sense of "closure," for a superlative conveys the impression of a limit, end, or conclusion.

praeambulum), but they have nothing to do with items 3-5 above, and can easily be accounted for without referring to the form of the priamel, of which the list is but one part.[50]

As I have tried to show, the summary priamel is not only valid, but a skeletal form of the priamel. The summary priamel below exhibits a variation in the relationship of the foil to the climax, and shows how self-contained the form can be. This example ("Homeric epigram" V) is very similar to Sophocles' *Ant.* 332, and exhibits all of the characteristics noted above.

> Θεστορίδη, θνητοῖσιν ἀνωΐστων πολέων περ,
> οὐδὲν ἀφραστότερον πέλεται νόου ἀνθρώποισιν.

Here, instead of an adversative particle, there is a concessive participle with περ to mark the superior relationship of the climactic

---

[50] One of the problems in Kröhling's work is that he does not distinguish between a general statement which is then elaborated by examples, and examples which *lead up to* the subject in question. Thus, for him Ovid, *A.A.* 2.517-19:

> Quot lepores in Atho, quot apes pascuntur in Hybla,
> Caerula quot bacas Palladis arbor habet,
> Littore quot conchae, *tot sunt in amore dolores.*

and *Tr.* 4.1.55-56:

> *meque tot adversis cumulant*, quot litus harenas,
> quotque fretum pisces, ovaque piscis habet.

are both priamels (as are Vergil, *Ecl.* 5.76-78 and Tib. 1.4.65-66): cf. pp. 20-22. Granted that the subject matter is very similar, and that Ovid is drawing on a hackneyed τόπος and perhaps is not very concerned about the nice distinctions we have been making, (being more concerned with rhetorical amplification and variation), but one essential feature of the priamel as we have defined it is *to lead up to something*; without that qualification, *any list* would qualify. Indeed, the word which Kröhling uses to define priamel—*Beispielreihung*—indicates too much emphasis on mere lists.

I have purposely chosen these examples from Ovid as extreme examples, for they both are saying the same thing in more or less the same words. The only real difference is in the formal order of presentation. In the example from the *Ars Amatoria*, there is suspense, "tension," as one waits to see how these anaphoric *quot*'s will apply to something of intrinsic interest. There is a sense of climax when the *tot* is finally reached and of completion when the withheld *dolores* finally comes. In the example from the *Tristia*, on the other hand, there is no tension, no expectation, and the list merely ends, although it could have been continued indefinitely. The effect of the first is to concentrate attention on *dolores*; the effect of the latter is to concentrate attention on large numbers, for the longer the list, the further away one gets from *adversis* (55). The first has the function of *introducing* the *dolores*; the latter has the function of *augmenting* the *adversis*. In spite of all their apparent similarities, there is a great difference between these passages. In general it will be seen that Kröhling emphasizes content, whereas our criteria for a priamel stress *form* and *function*.

term (νοῦς), reinforced by the superlative (οὐδὲν ἀφραστότερον = ἀφραστότατον). (Cf. Eur. *fr.* 282.1-2).

Contrary to previous studies, which cite the list of man's achievements in the lines following the summary priamel at *Ant.* 332 as part of the priamel, I regard them rather as a list which verifies or proves the truth of the assertion: "none is more wonderful than man." In other words, once the summary priamel has selected the subject of interest, the poet elaborates on it, but the list of examples does not *itself* lead up to an analogous or contrasting point.[51] In contrast is the list of δεινά at Aesch. *Choe.* 585-601, which does indeed culminate in the παντόλμους ἔρωτας (597) of women—the subject of the ode.

Finally, rather than try to give a strict definition of the priamel, I have drawn upon all the previous definitions in order to isolate five elements which regularly are found in priamels. With this working scheme of the form in mind, we can turn to an examination of the rhetorical functions of the priamel.

C. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRIAMEL TO OTHER RHETORICAL FORMS

Perhaps the most obvious reason for the absence of any awareness of the priamel in ancient rhetorical treatises is the fact that they are on the whole concerned with forensic oratory, where the priamel—basically a poetic form—has little place. Also, the genus of oratory to which the priamel is almost confined, the epideictic, is the one which is least treated. Although there are discussions of figures and forms closely related to the priamel (e.g. simile, comparison, climax), there is no recognition of a specific form in which multiple examples lead up to, or introduce (= *praeambulum*) a particular topic. There are general instructions concerning the topics of *exordia* beginning with Aristotle, but there is no mention of the priamel as a specific type. It is the purpose of the following pages to discuss the priamel in relation to other forms, and to distinguish it from them.

---

[51] It is, rather, an extended review of man's actual achievements, with increasing emphasis, at the end, on his obligations and limitations. But lines 333-372 do not constitute a priamel. In general, one can distinguish readily enough a priamel from a mere list by determining whether or not it is "foil" for a following subject of more intrinsic interest.

1. *Comparison and Example*

One important aspect of the priamel is the comparison of the final element with preceding examples, either in terms of analogy or contrast. If there is simply a comparison between two items (as in epic similes), then ancient rhetorical manuals have much to say. Obviously then, the priamel, which employs multiple examples, will share in the virtues of the simple comparison. Let us begin with an example from a monologue in Menander, preserved in a rhetorical treatise to illustrate λεπτολογία (Alex. περὶ σχημάτων, *Rh. Gr.* 3.18.17 ff. Sp.), *fr.* 656 Koerte:

μὰ τὴν 'Αθηνᾶν, ἄνδρες, εἰκόν' οὐκ ἔχω
<εὑρεῖν> ὁμοίαν τῷ γεγονότι πράγματι,
ζητῶν πρὸς ἐμαυτόν, τί ταχέως ἀπολλύει.
στρόβιλος; ἐν <ὅσ>ῳ συστρέφεται, προσέρχεται,
προσέβαλεν, ἐξήρειψεν, αἰὼν γίνεται.
ἀλλ' ἐν πελάγει συγκλυσμός; ἀναπνοὴν ἔχεις
'Ζεῦ σῶτερ' εἰπεῖν 'ἀντέχου τῶν σχοινίων',
ἑτέραν περιμεῖναι χἀτέραν τρικυμίαν·
ναυαγίου δ' ἂν ἐπιλάβοι', *ἐγὼ δ'* ἅπαξ
ἁψάμενός εἰμι καὶ φιλήσας ἐν βυθῷ.

Although Alexander cites this passage in order to illustrate the fact that detailed description emphasizes slowness, he notes: αὔξησιν δὲ ἔχει τὸ σχῆμα, ὅταν ταχυτῆτα ἢ βραδυτῆτα ἐμφῆναι θέλωμεν, ἢ τάχος ἐξ ἀντιπαραθέσεως ποιῆσαι φανερόν, ὥσπερ ὁ Μένανδρος (3.19.11-13 Sp.). Menander is not only using the figure of λεπτολογία for amplification (αὔξησις) and emphasis (ἐμφῆναι, ποιῆσαι φανερόν) within the comparisons themselves, but he is then using the examples as foil for the youth's own experience. In other words, the amplification and emphasis are raised one more degree with the climactic term.[52]

In discussing *similitudo* (παραβολή) and *exemplum* (παράδειγμα), the author of the *Rhetoric ad Herennium* notes that there are four purposes for using comparisons:[53] 1) *ornandi*, 2) *probandi*, 3) *apertius dicendi*,

---

[52] Note the five elements in this priamel: 1) general context: τί ταχέως ἀπολλύει; 2) quantity: στρόβιλος, συγκλυσμός and the variety suggested by ζητῶν; 3) capping particle (change of person): ἐγὼ δέ; 4) an indication of relative merit: οὐχ ὁμοίαν ("without equal"); 5) subject of ultimate interest: ἁψάμενός εἰμι...ἐν βυθῷ. On the "game" of trying to discover an appropriate εἰκών, cf. E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960) 163-164, who discusses this example.

[53] *Ad Her.* 4.59 (on *similitudo*) and 62 (on *exemplum*). Concerning this passage, and on comparisons in general, cf. M. H. McCall, *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison* (Harvard 1969) 65-81 *et passim*.

and 4) *ante oculos ponendi.* These four functions apply to priamels as well. In the case of the fragment of Menander it is clear that the examples of whirlwind and shipwreck provide *ornatus*, embellishment, to what would otherwise be a straightforward declaration. "The ornate," as Quintilian notes (8.3.61), "is something that goes beyond what is merely lucid and acceptable" (H. E. Butler, trans.), and comparisons are an especially important means for "illuminating" (*inferendam lucem*, 8.3.72) one's topic. In time, particularly in later Latin priamels, embellishment comes more and more to be thought of in terms of copious lists of examples.

There is also a logical element in comparisons, when examples are adduced to prove the truth of an assertion. In general, since most examples of priamels are found in poetry, where the analogy is illustrative (paradigmatic) rather than strictly logical, this logical element is minimized, but it is never entirely lacking. It appears frequently in priamels in Homer, as in the case where Zeus "proves" the extent of his passion for Hera at *Il.* 14.315-328 by citing his earlier amours.[54] The youth in *fr.* 656 "proves" just how swift his fall was by comparing it with storms and shipwrecks. The climax: ἐγὼ δ' ἅπαξ / ἀφάμενός εἰμι καὶ φιλήσας ἐν βυθῷ (9-10) would certainly carry less conviction without the examples cited.[55]

Comparisons shed light on, make more apparent or striking the object under consideration. They clarify by analogy aspects which would otherwise remain unexpressed. In the example from Menander, the catastrophic swiftness of his plunge into love is made clear (φανερόν) by comparing it with natural disasters, which at least give one a chance to prepare.

Finally, comparisons can be used to arouse πάθος by means of vivid description (*ante oculos ponendi*). What would otherwise be a bare statement of fact or opinion becomes vivid, when measured against specific examples. The element of πάθος—like that of proof—may be present in greater or lesser degree, but when it is present, as in the case of Lucretius 2.1 ff., the effect is striking. In the Menander fragment the vividness of the young man's

[54] When the subject under discussion has already been announced and the burden of the priamel is not selection (cf. Theogn. 699 ff.), then the element of proof is greater. There are many "explanatory" priamels introduced with γάρ or *nam*, as at Theogn. 783 ff.

[55] In this case, the examples also prove his assertion that he can discover no comparable εἰκών.

experience is amplified. As Alexander puts it (3.18.30-31): τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ηὔξησε πάθος ταχύτερον ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων λεπτολογίας ἀποδείξας.

2. *Amplification*

Present in the Menander fragment, and in many priamels, is the motive of amplification. By taking its place among—or surpassing—a group of other things, the item of interest derives relative importance. This use of comparison (σύγκρισις) to invest something with grandeur (μέγεθος περιθεῖναι) by showing the superiority (ὑπεροχή) of the subject is, as Aristotle points out (*Rh.* 1.9.39-40. 1368a21-29), most appropriate to epideictic topics, and is the motive behind a large proportion of priamels (e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 332).[56]

We have noted the frequency with which superlatives are found in the cap of the priamel, and in large measure this is due to ὑπεροχή. Out of the catalogue of examples cited, often emerges a hierarchy in which the last item "puts in the shade" the other examples. In the priamel from Menander, there is no need for a superlative in the climax because the speaker has already stated that there is no adequate parallel (εἰκόνα, 1) for his experience (τῷ γεγονότι πράγματι, 2): οὐχ ... ὁμοίαν (1-2) indicates that the other examples are "inferior." When we get to the climax, signalled by the change of person ἐγώ, the adversative δέ, and the prominent ἅπαξ (= "immediately upon"), we know that its swiftness will surpass the previous examples.[57]

3. *ἀπορία (dubitatio)*

Quintilian describes this figure in the following way: *adfert aliquam fidem veritatis et dubitatio, cum simulamus quaerere nos, unde incipiendum, ubi desinendum, quid potissimum dicendum, an omnino dicendum sit* (9.2.19). It is most common in *exordia*, and it is a common motive for a priamel, as at *h. Hom.* 3.207 ff.: πῶς τ' ἄρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως

---

[56] On the relationship of αὔξησις and σύγκρισις in early rhetorical theory, cf. V. Buchheit, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristotles* (Munich 1960) 15-26. On p. 18 he cites the priamel of Tyrt. 12W as an example.

[57] Menander has, however, reserved a very nice turn of phrase to enhance the climax. As A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach note in their *Menander, A Commentary* (Oxford 1973) 718: "The hyberbaton is notable. The intertwining of ἀφάμενος καὶ φιλήσας and εἰμι ἐν βυθῷ mirrors the simultaneity of the embrace with being drowned by love."

εὔυμνον ἐόντα; or Horace C. 1.31.1 ff.[58] Menander's young man admits his inability (οὐκ ἔχω / εὑρεῖν, 1-2) to come up with a suitable comparison, as he searches (ζητῶν, 3; cf. *quaero* in Latin examples) for an analogue for τί ταχέως ἀπολλύει (3). To give verisimilitude to his *zētēsis*,[59] as well as to provide a basis of comparison for the catastrophic event revealed in the climax, he essays two examples, which, though impressive in their own right, nevertheless fall short of his experience. Note the generality implied in the word ζητῶν (one must suppose a quantity and variety of possibilities entertained), out of which two specific examples are put forward, before being capped by the point of it all: the "whirlwind" and "shipwreck" of love, where one lands immediately ἐν βυθῷ. While the single comparison supplies another frame of reference by which to view the subject at hand, the priamel based on *aporia* sketches a greater range of analogues. Furthermore, there is considerable tension created, as one awaits the "answer."

4. *Praeteritio or Recusatio*

F. Dornseiff noted that an introductory priamel can have affinities with a *praeteritio*,[60] a "by-passing" of subjects in order to arrive at one of more relevance or propriety. There are many such priamels which are explicitly or implicity *praeteritiones*, especially those which "seek" (zētēsis) a subject out of various possibilities. The items which are bypassed are, nevertheless named (and frequently given a bit of elaboration); they fulfill the role of "foil" in the same way that the background examples in any priamel give way to the point of interest. The general scheme *not A*, *not B*, *but C* can form the basis of *praeteritio* as it can for any priamel. The implicit structure of the fragment from Menander answering the question τί ταχέως ἀπολλύει; is: not A (whirlwind), not B (shipwreck), but C (a hug and kiss). This same form can be used in a related type, the *recusatio* (the literary equivalent of the forensic *praeteritio*), as in this example from Mart. 10.4.9-10:

non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.

[58] On the relationship between priamels and ἀπορία cf. Bundy (1972) 47 n. 32 and 58-70.

[59] The motif of a search or journey is often explicit in priamels, as in the journey of Leto at *h. Hom.* 3.30-49. Cf. Theogn. 783-788 and Keats' "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer."

[60] Cf. *supra* p. 8. Cf. the long *praeteritio* at Ibycus 3D (= 282 PMG).

5. *The Exordium*

It is obvious, in spite of the lack of a context, that the passage from Menander is the opening of a monologue. As such, it is one example of many which illustrates the prooimial character of the priamel. The speaker wishes to broach his subject and to say something striking about it, but he doesn't want to do it directly, lest a due appreciation of its unique character be lacking. That is the reason for avoiding too specific a reference to the nature of the subject of ultimate interest, which he vaguely refers to as τῷ γεγονότι πράγματι (2). It is not really until the very last line that its exact nature is given: a hug and kiss. This withholding of specific information until the very end is an essential feature of the priamel, for it is one of the ways of "closing" or "completing" the form, after having aroused an expectation.[61] This technique is especially appropriate to an introduction, one of whose goals is *auditorem intentum parare* (cf. Arist. *Rh.* 3.14.7.1415a34-b3; *ad Her.* 1.11).

From its very name (*praeambulum*), the close connection of a priamel with an introduction is obvious. Unfortunately, the discussions of *exordia* in the standard rhetorical treatises are so concerned with forensic and deliberative topics that there is little which applies to poetic introductions, where the priamel is almost exclusively found. Aristotle does, however, mention two aspects of epideictic *prooimia*, amplification (αὐξῆσαι) and embellishment (κόσμος),[62] which are important features of priamels. Menander the Rhetor (*Rh. Gr.* 3.368 ff.) also stresses the importance of αὔξησις in introductory passages, not only at the beginning of a speech, but also when introducing new topics.

In discussing Menander *fr.* 656, we touched upon the ability of the priamel to introduce a subject by sketching first a general con-

---

[61] The sense of closure or completion is a very important feature of priamels. Although she is speaking specifically of poems, the remarks of B. H. Smith, *Poetic Closure* (Chicago 1968) 36 could just as well apply to priamels: "Closure occurs when the concluding portion of a poem creates in the reader a sense of appropriate cessation. It announces and justifies the absence of further development; it reinforces the feeling of finality, completion, and composure which we value in all works of art; and it gives ultimate unity and coherence to the reader's experience of the poem by providing a point from which all the preceding elements may be viewed comprehensively and their relations grasped as part of a significant design." Once a priamel has "arrived" at its subject of interest, the writer is free to elaborate as he wishes, and in that sense it is still "open," but *as a form itself* the priamel is "closed."

[62] Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 3.14.12.1415b38 ff.

text of possibilities, from which one (new) item is selected or preferred. As we noted, the effect is to contribute *amplificatio* (αὔξησις) and *ornatus* (κόσμος) to the writer's choice. The priamel *specifies* the theme, either by relating it to similar things, or by distinguishing it from them, or, indeed, by both at once, when a hierarchical relationship is established. Out of the "catalogue" emerges, with the arrival of the climax, an "analogue", an ordering principle, which relates the items to one another, and at the same time *distinguishes* (both in the sense of "separates" and "confers distinction upon") the last. Invariably, the chosen theme is granted superiority in the *hic et nunc*, while the foil terms are granted theirs in "other" times and places. It is because of this ability to relate the "general other" with the "specific this" that the priamel is so useful in introductions.

Of many other examples, we might cite this late (perhaps Carolingian) introduction to the Second Book of the *Catonis disticha*:[63]

> Telluris si forte velis cognoscere cultus,
> Vergilium legito; quodsi mage nosse laboras
> herbarum vires, Macer haec tibi carmina dicit;
> si Romana cupis et Punica noscere bella,
> Lucanum quaeres, qui Martis proelia dixit;
> si quid amare libet vel discere amare legendo,
> Nasonem petito; *sin autem cura tibi haec est*
> *ut sapiens vivas, audi* quae discere possis...

Poetry treats a variety of useful subjects (*telluris...cultus*, *herbarum vires*, *bella*, *amare*), and there are writers who excel in each type (Vergil, Macer, Lucan, and Ovid). It is against this background that the *present* work is distinguished. There are certain advantages inherent in the form of the priamel, and even this somewhat pedestrian example exploits some of them, in order to amplify the forthcoming work. First, there is the distinguished company with which the present work is *implicitly* compared. Then, there is the further hint that the present author will be as much an "expert" in his field as they are in theirs. Third, the present subject matter enjoys an advantage over the others, for it is far broader—he has deliberately so contrived it in his choice of authors and works. Fourth, he has put as the last item of "foil" the least serious of the

---

[63] Quoted from J. W. and A. M. Duff, *Minor Latin Poets* (Harvard 1934) 602-604.

works, so that the final contrast will be the more striking. And last, he has purposely chosen the verbs *velis* (1), *laboras* (2), *cupis* (4), and *libet* (6) to describe the motivation (and toil) involved in reading the other authors, whereas the motivation for reading his work is *cura* (7) (note the prominent position). Thus, when we get to the climactic introduction of the subject itself (7-8):

> sin autem cura tibi haec est,
> ut sapiens vivas, audi...

we are meant to have the impression that the present work is of considerable stature on a subject of "serious" concern[64] and obvious general importance (*viz.*, *sapientia*), the only subject in the list with which everyone should be concerned. By means of the priamel, the subject is given distinctness (ποιῆσαι φανερόν, *apertius dicere*), amplification (αὔξησις, *ornatus*), and a slight hint of superiority (ὑπεροχή), even though no explicit superlative is to be found.

6. *Climax*

The rhetorical figure of κλῖμαξ (*gradatio*) (of which the favorite example is Dem. *de Cor.* 179), is too narrowly defined by ancient rhetoricians to apply in general to the form of the priamel. It consists of a very rigid interlocking of words, in which each phrase picks up the last word of the previous statement and builds upon it (cf. Quint. 9.3.54-57). There is a good example at Verg. *Ecl.* 2. 63-65, where the forms of the *climax* and priamel merge, creating a very specific type of priamel.

When the word "climax" is used in this study, it has nothing to do with the rhetorical figure, but refers to the last elements of the priamel which "close" or "complete" the form. Unlike the κλῖμαξ, in which there must be a continual intensification of each of its parts, the priamel is free to relate diverse and general phenomena to a specific point of reference, which is held to the end for "climactic" effect. It is convenient to consider the κλῖμαξ a species of priamel, but its use is quite limited and often restricted to the mere search for the proper words with which to describe something.

7. *Catalogues*

The relationship between priamels and catalogues (or lists) is quite complicated. On the one hand, it is easy to make a distinction

---

[64] Duff's translation (*Ibid.*, 604) captures the force of this priamel: "But if your serious aim is a life of wisdom..."

between an "open-ended" list (one which gives details about a point already made and could continue indefinitely: "many are the wonders...") and a "closed" list (one which is rhetorically or logically complete only when its last term is reached). Both kinds of lists are common, but their effects are quite distinct. The former substantiates or fills in what we have already been told, and the mind delights in the details of specification. Many of the catalogues in Homer and Hesiod are of this type, simply specific enumerations which come to an end because the items have been depleted or because the poet simply stops.[65] The priamel, however, "culminates" in a "point" by singling out the precise object of interest. This difference is obvious enough if one compares the list of occupations in Horace C. 1.1.3-38 which culminates in the "profession" of the poet, with the catalogue of gods and goddesses at Hes. *Theog.* 11-21 which simply ends with "and the holy race of all the other deathless ones that are forever" (H. G. Evelyn-White, trans.).

There are, however, a number of catalogues in Homer and Hesiod which end with the most important term. For example, at *Od.* 11.285 Chloris is said to have borne glorious children, and a list ensues (286-287):

> Νέστορά τε Χρομίον τε Περικλύμενόν τ' ἀγέρωχον.
> τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμην Πηρὼ τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι,
> τήν...

The relative τήν (288) then leads into the story of the wooing of Pero, towards which the poet was obviously heading (the passage is, after all, in the catalogue of women in the *Nekyia*). In that sense, the passage functions as a priamel: out of a list emerges one item of special interest which then receives more elaborate treatment. Furthermore, all five elements of the priamel can be accounted for: 1) general context: ἀγλαὰ τέκνα (285); 2) a list (286-287); 3) a slightly adversative expression: τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' (287); 4) a heightening of merit: θαῦμα βροτοῖσι (287); and 5) the subject of ultimate interest: Pero (287). This passage is a good example of many borderline cases which demonstrate the impossibility of formulating an exact definition of the priamel. *A la rigueur* one could argue that this is a

---

[65] Such lists are especially frequent in cultic hymns, when the poet simply lists the epithets and δυνάμεις of the god without any desire to single out one or to close the form.

priamel, but the form is attenuated just enough (the list of men is not really "foil") for one to be justified in saying that this passage has many elements commonly found in priamels, but is itself not a typically straightforward example.

There are a number of lists in Hesiod which terminate with a preeminent individual, as an almost formulaic way of "completing" the list.[66] Here again motifs of the priamel are present, but although the last item receives a special place, one would not say that the other items are "foil" simply so that the last item could stand out. An example is the catalogue of the eldest nymphs at Hesiod *Theog.* 349 ff., which ends with the most important individual (361):

καὶ Στύξ, ἣ δή σφεων προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἁπασέων.

Here, Styx is given preeminence over all the rest, as would be the case in priamels. But this is not a priamel, because the singling out of Styx is not done in order to make her the ultimate subject of interest—indeed, the poet sums up the catalogue in the next lines (362 ff.) and moves on to other nymphs—but in order to put a *punctum* to his list.[67] Likewise, at *h. Hom.* 2.109-110, when the four daughters of Celeus are listed, the fourth is singled out as the eldest of all (ἣ τῶν προγενεστάτη ἦεν ἁπασῶν, 110), not because any special attention to her is forthcoming (indeed, she is never mentioned again), but simply in order to complete the list.[68] In sum, many of the ways of ordering a catalogue are also used in priamels and the two can approach one another in form. The main distinction in such cases depends upon the extent to which the last item really "eclipses" the previous ones, and in the absence of sure formal clues, the function and context provide the test. When a poet, for example, ends a catalogue with his own work, or places himself at the end of a tradition of poets, we know that a special emphasis is

---

[66] M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 38-39 discusses the various arrangements of genealogies. For other examples of lists completed by superlatives (besides those discussed below) cf. *Theog.* 79, 137, 231 and *Scutum* 260.

[67] There is a sense in which a superlative [especially when reinforced by ἄλλων or (ἁ)πασῶν], by stating the most extreme case, creates a terminus which leaves nothing more to be said.

[68] The marvelous imitation of these passages by Plato at *Phdr.* 259d has a much greater sense of climax (in fact it is best described as a priamel). Its structure is hierarchical, ending (naturally) with philosophy. Its purpose is to exhort Phaedrus to the study of philosophy.

placed on the last, and that the previous items have in fact been "leading up" to the last one.

8. *Parallelism and Repetition*

One of the ways by which a priamel may arouse a sense of expectation is through *parallelismus membrorum*, often combined with *anaphora*. This technique serves to emphasize each separate item of foil, creating in turn a growing interest in getting to the final term. The syntactical relationships between introductory terms and the conclusion are subject to great variety. Sometimes the relationship is parallel (*ut* A, *ut* B, *sic* C; A, B, C *quoque*), sometimes it is concessive (*licet* A, *licet* B, C *tamen*, *solus*), but in the majority of cases it is adversative (*non* A, *non* B, *sed* C; A, B, C *contra*). All of these types (and many variations of them) become frequent to the point of stereotype in the Augustan and later Latin authors. In spite of the abuse to which they can be subject, parallelism and repetition can add considerable emotional force to the climactic term, as in Lucretius 2.1-7: *suave...suave...sed nil dulcius est.*

9. *The Simile*

As we have shown, the priamel is a type of comparison; but so too is the simile. Although it is simple enough to distinguish one simile (where there is a one-to-one comparison), the distinction becomes more difficult when multiple similes are employed. On the one hand, there is merely the addition of simile upon simile to heighten the effect, as at *Il.* 16.751-771. On the other hand, when each simile becomes a unit in a series which culminates in the subject of interest, then the passage can properly be considered a priamel, as in the case of *Il.* 14.394-401. Another example is Prop. 1.3.1-8:

> *Qualis* Thesea iacuit cedente carina
>   languida desertis Cnosia litoribus;
> *qualis* et accubuit primo Cepheia somno
>   libera iam duris cotibus Andromede;
> nec minus assiduis Edonis fessa choreis
>   *qualis* in herboso concidit Apidano:
> *talis visa mihi* mollem spirare quietem
>   *Cynthia* non certis nixa caput manibus...

Here is another case in which the priamel and another form merge. In practice, it really makes no *formal* difference whether the

examples in a priamel are in the form of a simile or not. What gives the priamel its particular character is the fact that an entire *series* leads up *as a group* to some point.

10. *ἀδύνατα*

A list of events (often *impossibilia*, ἀδύνατα) is quite often used as a form of asseveration to emphasize the *likelihood* of something being or not being the case. There are many variations of this form, and many of them are priamels. Below are examples of several important types of ἀδύνατα which are priamels.[69]

The reference can be to the future. Here the examples are usually of natural phenomena which *always* occur, as at Verg. *Ecl.* 5.76-78:[70]

> dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis amabit,
> dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae,
> *semper* honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.

The reference can also be to the past as in the case of *Il.* 14.315-328, where Zeus assures Hera that he *never* (οὐ...πώ ποτε, 315) was so amorous, *not even when* (οὐδ' ὁπότε, 317 ff.) A, or B, or C, as he is *now* (νῦν, 328) for her.

The reference can also be potential, as when Achilles refuses the gifts of Agamemnon at *Il.* 9.379 ff.: *not even if* (οὐδ' εἰ, 379 ff.) he should give me A, B, or C, would I marry his daughter [cf. Archilochus 74 (122W): μηδ' ἐάν (7); Tyrtaeus 12W: οὐδ' εἰ (3 ff.); and Theogn. 699 ff.: οὐδ' εἰ (701 ff.)].

All these are hyperbolic attestations, and the poet is free to make the individual terms of the foil as grandiose, striking, or impossible as he wishes. Beginning with Archilochus 74 (122W), the content of many of these became stereotyped as "reversals of nature," and expressions of "innumerability."

The relationship of these forms with the priamel is complex, and as in the case of all catalogues, the list can follow the general statement in order to prove it (as in the case of Archilochus 74), or it can precede the announcement, creating suspense (as in the case of

---

[69] For a good bibliography on ἀδύνατα, cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (above, note 19) 341-342.

[70] Cf. ἔς τ' ἄν at *A.P.* 7.153 and in the fragment attributed to Critias at Athen. 13.600E. The same notion can be expressed through a double negative, as in *A.P.* 9.575: sooner (τάχιον, 1) will A, B, and C happen than Homer's name will ever (ποτέ, 5) he forgotten. In Latin *prius*, *citius*, and *ante...quam* are very frequent.

Tyrtaeus 12W). It can also follow an assertion, and in turn lead up to a conclusion (as in the case of *Il.* 14.315-328, *Il.* 9.378-391, and Theogn. 699-718). There is even the complex example of Theocr. 1.132-136, which leads up to the death of Daphnis, and then follows with even more examples. It is clear from these examples that a poet is free to vary his material as he wishes, and that the same material may or may not be cast in the form of a priamel. When the list of examples clearly leads up to a conclusion, we have considered it a priamel.

11. *The Gnome*

One of the exercises in the Προγυμνάσματα of Hermogenes (p. 8 Rabe) and Aphthonius (2.27 Sp.) is the expansion (ἐργασία) of a γνώμη by means of comparison (ἐκ παραβολῆς) and example (ἐκ παραδείγματος). Any *gnome* or *sententia* can be expanded by specific examples and comparisons, inasmuch as it is a generalized statement. For example, the three sapphic stanzas attributed to Sulpicius Lupercus Servasius Junior (A.L. 1.2, p. 116 no. 648 = J. W. Duff & A. M. Duff, *Minor Latin Poets*, *LCL* p. 576) exhibit such a working-out of the *sententia* ''*omne... labascit*'':

Omne quod natura parens creavit,
quamlibet firmum videas, labascit:
tempore ac longo fragile et caducum
solvitur usu.

amnis insueta solet ire valle,
mutat et rectos via certa cursus,
rupta cum cedit male pertinaci
ripa fluento.

decidens scabrum cavat unda tofum,
ferreus vomis tenuatur agris,
splendet attrito digitos honorans
anulus auro.

This poem (if indeed it is complete) is a good example of an open-ended catalogue, and lacks a climactic term to make it a priamel. But the question arises, if the list of examples is followed by the *gnome*, then does that constitute a priamel? In reality, there are few examples of this ''inductive'' list, because it is somewhat too logical for poetry, and the final gnome is anticlimactic unless a type of riddle is involved, for if the relationship of the examples is clear, then

the final statement of that relationship will tend to be anticlimactic and otiose. The only such example which Kröhling cites[71] is from Maximianus, a sixth-century Latin poet (*Elegies* 1.269-274, Bährens, PLM, 5.328), but the point of the priamel is not the gnome at the end of the catalogue (*et nullum est quod non tempore cedat opus*, 274). That is just a summary before the application to the poet himself (*sed mihi*, 275).

Summary

We have seen that the forms and functions of the classical priamel show considerable overlap with other rhetorical structures. Although this complex interrelation makes strict definition of the priamel impossible, it does allow the priamel a great deal of diversity in its functions and variety in its content and form. In general, however, the priamel is distinguished from the other forms by the fact that a multiplicity of items exists as "foil" for what is truly more important or intrinsically interesting.

---

[71] (above, note 8) 13 and 63.

PART I: GREEK LITERATURE

A. EPIC AND HOMERIC HYMNS

1. *Homer*

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* exhibit all the basic types of priamel, and in considerable variety; in this case as is so many others, Homer provides the models and forms for later authors.

One group of summary priamels serves to elevate the subject under consideration above many (πολλά, μυρία) or all (πάντες) other phenomena in the same category. In the *Odyssey* the shade of Agamemnon twice uses the same form, the first time to bewail his own death (φόνος) at *Od.* 11.416-420:

> ἤδη μὲν *πολέων* φόνῳ ἀνδρῶν ἀντεβόλησας,
> μουνὰξ κτεινομένων καὶ ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ·
> *ἀλλά* κε *κεῖνα μάλιστα* ἰδὼν ὀλοφύραο θυμῷ,
> ὡς ἀμφὶ κρητῆρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας
> κείμεθ' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ, δάπεδον δ' ἅπαν αἵματι θῦεν.

and the second to praise the splendor of Achilles' funeral (τάφος) at *Od.* 24.87-92:

> ἤδη μὲν *πολέων* τάφῳ ἀνδρῶν ἀντεβόλησας
> ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν ποτ' ἀποφθιμένου βασιλῆος
> ζώννυνταί τε νέοι καὶ ἐπεντύνονται ἄεθλα·
> *ἀλλά* κε *κεῖνα μάλιστα* ἰδὼν θηήσαο θυμῷ,
> *οἷ'* ἐπὶ σοὶ κατέθηκε θεὰ περικαλλέ' ἄεθλα,
> ἀργυρόπεζα Θέτις· μάλα γὰρ φίλος ἦσθα θεοῖσιν.

I have given both in full in order to show how the same form can, with subtle variations, express very different emotions. The basic structure consists of a contrast (ἤδη μὲν πολέων ... ἀλλά κε κεῖνα), by means of which the many "other" events are eclipsed (μάλιστα) by the present one.[1] But it is in the elaboration of the foil that the main difference lies, for in the second example it is the quality (οἷα) of the ἄεθλα (89, 91) which forms the basis of comparison, whereas in the first, two types of deaths are singled out (417):

> μουνὰξ κτεινομένων καὶ ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ.

[1] Note also the deictic κεῖνα. The change of syntax and mood helps to signal the climax.

Here, the contrast is in *manner* (ὡς, 419), and it is this which makes Agamemnon's (and Cassandra's) death so much more pitiable than the many deaths which he and Achilles had witnessed in battle.

Another summary priamel of similar form expresses the delight of the soldiers when Odysseus strikes Thersites at *Il.* 2.272-274:

> "ὢ πόποι, ἦ δὴ *μυρί'* Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργε
> βουλάς τ' ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς πόλεμόν τε κορύσσων·
> *νῦν δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον* ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν..."

The multitude of Odysseus' good works is further specified in the doublet "counsel and war" (273), before the climactic term (274): νῦν δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον...[2] The briefest summary priamel occurs at the opening of Eurylochus' disastrous appeal to the comrades to eat the cattle of Helios (*Od.* 12.341-42):

> πάντες μὲν στυγεροὶ θάνατοι δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
> *λιμῷ δ' οἴκτιστον* θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν.

In the word πάντες we are invited to supply specific instances, *but* to die of hunger is the *most pitiful.* So argues Eurylochus; here the form of the priamel is used to conceal questionable logic.

Another example from Homer will show the relationship between the summary and the list priamel. At *Il.* 13.636-639, when the Greeks are hard pressed, Menelaos prays to Zeus for some relief, and uses a priamel to express the fanatical insatiability of the Trojans for battle.

> πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστί, καὶ ὕπνου καὶ φιλότητος
> μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο,
> *τῶν πέρ τις καὶ μᾶλλον* ἐέλδεται ἐξ ἔρον εἶναι
> ἢ πολέμου· *Τρῶες δὲ* μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν.

The skeleton of the statement is: πάντων *μὲν* κόρος ἐστὶ ... Τρῶες *δὲ* μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν. The adversative δέ completes the priamel and the prominent Τρῶες (answering τις, 638) and μάχης (answering πάντων, 636) specify exceptions to the general principle formulated. In the intervening lines occur examples of sleep, sex, song, and dance (636-637), which are then collectively summarized (τῶν,

---

[2] Note the focusing words: temporal (νῦν), logical (δέ), and spatial (τόδε) and the superlative (ἄριστον). Similar summary expressions exist in prayers, where the "hypomnesis" (recollection of past favors) serves as foil for the climactic petition. Cf. *Il.* 10.278-280 (αἰεί, 278; πάντεσσι, 279); Sappho *fr.* 1 (αἴ ποτα κἀτέρωτα, 5); Pindar I. 7.1-21 (τῶν πάρος, 1); and the list at Sen. *H.O.* 558-562.

638)[3] as being more desirable than war. μᾶλλον (638) provides the evaluative motif usually found in the climax, but here a part of the foil so that the surprise of the cap will be more effective.[4] The logic of the passage is clear: it consists of an *argumentum a fortiori*, and the Trojans are, in Menelaos' estimation, flying in the face of rational behavior.[5]

One use of the summary priamel which becomes a standard topic in later oratory is already present in Homer, namely the rhetorical posture of having much to say, but needing to limit it. Regardless of what circumstances necessitate the abridgement, this creates a situation with which the priamel is especially able to deal: *selecting the salient or important detail from a general context.* One brief example is *Od.* 4.240-243:

---

[3] The summary of the foil terms *as a group* before the climax is very common. Usually a form of πᾶς is present, and here it could easily be understood: τῶν (πάντων). Cf. τῶν πάντων at *Od.* 4.104, which reiterates πάντας at 100 and is occasioned because the foil (πολλάκις ... ἄλλοτε ... ἄλλοτε, 101-103) has led so far away that recapitulation is necessary. In this climax adversative asyndeton (104) answers the μέν (100), οὐ τόσσον ... ὡς (104-105) is equivalent to a superlative, and the actual name of Odysseus is withheld (107) for effect.

[4] This is the first of a number of priamels in which the climax presents an extraordinary or exceptional case. The logic of the foil creates an expectation of a certain consequence, and the climax surprisingly contradicts it. The tone is often ironic or sarcastic, and the word μόνος (*solus*) is frequently present (or implied). Cf. Theogn. 183-188, [Theocr.] 20.34-42, Prop. 2.1.57-58, and Ovid *Ex P.* 3.3.41-46.

[5] Cf. the delightful parody of this priamel at Aristoph. *Plutus* 189-193:

ΧΡ. τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἄλλων ἐστὶ *πάντων* πλησμονή.
ἔρωτος
ΚΑ. ἄρτων
ΧΡ. μουσικῆς
ΚΑ. τραγημάτων
ΧΡ. τιμῆς
ΚΑ. πλακούντων
ΧΡ. ἀνδραγαθίας
ΚΑ. ἰσχάδων
ΧΡ. φιλοτιμίας
ΚΑ. μάζης
ΧΡ. στρατηγίας
ΚΑ. φακῆς.
ΧΡ. *σοῦ δ'* [*sc.* Πλούτου] ἐγένετ' οὐδεὶς μεστὸς οὐδεπώποτε.

For a summary priamel where *diversity* (ἄλλος δ' ἄλλῳ) serves as foil for the introduction of the subject of interest, cf. *Il.* 2.400-403. Note the adversative αὐτάρ (402), and the indication of greater importance in the personages of Agamemnon (ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, 402), Zeus (ὑπερμενέϊ Κρονίωνι, 403), and in the full-grown bull (403).

πάντα μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
ὅσσοι 'Οδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονός εἰσιν ἄεθλοι·
ἀλλ' οἷον τόδ' ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνὴρ
δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων, ὅθι πάσχετε πήματ' 'Αχαιοί.

Helen cannot tell Telemachus in detail all (πάντα) his father did, but (ἀλλά) this (τόδε) that she is about to tell will express the *quality* (οἷον, note the prominent position) of his deeds. The appropriateness of her selection is perfect: she tells how Odysseus dressed like a beggar to reconnoitre Troy![6]

At *Od.* 11.516 Odysseus tells the shade of Achilles that his son Neoptolemus had killed many (πολλούς) men in battle. He then continues (517-522):

πάντας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
ὅσσον λαὸν ἔπεφνεν ἀμύνων 'Αργείοισιν,
ἀλλ' οἷον τὸν Τηλεφίδην κατενήρατο χαλκῷ,
ἥρω' Εὐρύπυλον, πολλοὶ δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι
Κήτειοι κτείνοντο γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων.
κεῖνον δὴ *κάλλιστον* ἴδον μετὰ Μέμνονα δῖον.

As in the previous example, the speaker cannot tell everything, but he selects one example which "typifies" (οἷον) the others. Note the superlative κάλλιστον (522), which provides the evaluative motif.[7] It

---

[6] The word οἷον, almost exclamatory, provides the sense of a superlative, since it designates a deed which is a "crowning example." At *Od.* 4.266-270, right after Helen's speech, Menelaos opens his own with a summary priamel in which, out of his vast experience (πολέων, 267 and πολλήν, 268), he singles out Odysseus and one particular (τόδ', 271) deed. Note οἷον at 270 and 271. There is also a variation at *Od.* 7.241-243:

'Αργαλέον, βασίλεια, *διηνεκέως* ἀγορεῦσαι
κήδε', ἐπεί μοι *πολλὰ* δόσαν θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες·
τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω ὅ μ' ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς.

Here Odysseus cannot tell everything (διηνεκέως = πάντα) because there are so many (πολλά, 242), but (δέ) this much (τοῦτο) he will tell. Also cf. the delightful parody at *Batrach.* 178-185:

ὦ πάτερ οὐκ ἄν πώ ποτ' ἐγὼ μυσὶ τειρομένοισιν
ἐλθοίμην ἐπαρωγός, ἐπεὶ κακὰ *πολλά* μ' ἔοργαν
στέμματα βλάπτοντες καὶ λύχνους εἵνεκ' ἐλαίου.
τοῦτο δέ μοι *λίην* ἔδακε φρένας *οἷον* ἔρεξαν.
πέπλον μου κατέτρωξαν ὃν ἐξύφηνα καμοῦσα
ἐκ ῥοδάνης λεπτῆς καὶ στήμονα μακρὸν ἔνησα,
τρώγλας τ' ἐμποίησαν· ὁ δ' ἠπητής μοι ἐπέστη
καὶ πράσσει με τόκον· τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον ἀθανάτοισιν.

[7] Note the tact with which Odysseus qualifies the superlative with "next to Memnon."

is this ability of the priamel to select the essential detail from a mass of particulars that makes it such a frequent prooimial device when abbreviation is required.[8]

The priamel can also be cast in a more rigidly logical scheme, in which the final term's superiority is assumed from the beginning, and a series of negative comparisons leads up to it.[9] One form consists of the scheme οὐ τόσσον ... οὔτε ... οὔτε ... ὅσσον.[10] In spite of its rather rigid form, Homer uses it in very diverse situations and with striking results. At *Il.* 14.394-401 it amplifies the din of battle:

> *οὔτε* θαλάσσης κῦμα *τόσον* βοάᾳ ποτὶ χέρσον,
> ποντόθεν ὀρνύμενον πνοιῇ Βορέω ἀλεγεινῇ·
> *οὔτε* πυρὸς *τόσσος* γε ποτὶ βρόμος αἰθομένοιο
> οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς, ὅτε τ' ὤρετο καιέμεν ὕλην·
> *οὔτ'* ἄνεμος *τόσσον* γε περὶ δρυσὶν ὑψικόμοισι
> ἠπύει, ὅς τε *μάλιστα μέγα* βρέμεται χαλεπαίνων,
> *ὅσση* ἄρα Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἔπλετο φωνὴ
> δεινὸν ἀϋσάντων, ὅτ' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ὄρουσαν.

Contrary to many other priamels, which reserve the superlative to amplify the climactic term, this type amplifies the foil terms because implicit in the scheme is the superiority (ὑπεροχή) of the last. Thus, the penultimate term is given extra emphasis (μάλιστα μέγα, 399) to make the final contrast the more powerful. Homer does the same thing at *Il.* 6.450-455, but with an entirely different content and emotional cast:

> ἀλλ' *οὔ* μοι Τρώων *τόσσον* μέλει ἄλγος ὀπίσσω,
> *οὔτ'* αὐτῆς Ἑκάβης *οὔτε* Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος
> *οὔτε* κασιγνήτων, οἵ κεν πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ
> ἐν κονίῃσι πέσοιεν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν,
> *ὅσσον σεῦ*, ὅτε κέν τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
> δακρυόεσσαν ἄγηται, ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας.

In this poignant parting scene, Hector has just told Andromache in the same words used by Agamemnon at *Il.* 4.163-165 that he knows full well that Troy will fall. But out of the loss of city, parents, and all those brothers, it is the fate of Andromache which most moves him, and which he paints with such vividness in the succeeding lines.

---

[8] Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 153-154, Aristoph. *Thesmo.* 477-478, and 830-831. The two examples from Aristophanes are imitations of oratorical practice, where summary priamels frequently serve to introduce a striking point. Cf. *infra* pp. 105 and 112.

[9] Menander *fr.* 656 presents one type; cf. *supra* pp. 18 ff.

[10] Cf. Propertius 2.3.9-17: *nec me tam ... nec ... nec ... quantum.*

A related form lists instances from past experience which are surpassed by the present event. In the famous seduction episode at *Il.* 14.315-328, Zeus emphasizes the extent of his present passion in a long priamel:

οὐ γάρ *πώ ποτέ* μ' *ὧδε* θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς
θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσεν,
οὐδ' ὁπότ' ἠρασάμην Ἰξιονίης ἀλόχοιο,
ἣ τέκε Πειρίθοον, θεόφιν μήστωρ' ἀτάλαντον·
οὐδ' ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλισφύρου Ἀκρισιώνης,
ἣ τέκε Περσῆα, πάντων ἀριδείκετον ἀνδρῶν·
οὐδ' ὅτε Φοίνικος κούρης τηλεκλειτοῖο,
ἣ τέκε μοι Μίνων τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Ῥαδάμανθυν·
οὐδ' ὅτε περ Σεμέλης οὐδ' Ἀλκμήνης ἐνὶ Θήβῃ,
ἥ ῥ' Ἡρακλῆα κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα·
ἡ δὲ Διώνυσον Σεμέλη τέκε, χάρμα βροτοῖσιν·
οὐδ' ὅτε Δήμητρος καλλιπλοκάμοιο ἀνάσσης,
οὐδ' ὁπότε Λητοῦς ἐρικυδέος, *οὐδὲ* σεῦ αὐτῆς,
ὡς σέο νῦν ἔραμαι καί με γλυκὺς ἵμερος αἱρεῖ.

This form shows a deft mingling of temporal and quantitative elements. The priamel opens with a summary statement ("I have *never* been so amorous..."), and it is this which gives impetus to the expansion of foil terms, as the word ποτέ (315) is specified by the following ὅτε's and climaxes in νῦν (328). On the other hand, the evaluative motif is present in the progression: οὐ ... ὧδε (315) ... οὐδὲ ... οὐδὲ ... ὡς (328), where ὧδε is equivalent to ὅσσον, and ὡς is equivalent to τόσσον. All of this comes together in the cap: ὡς σέο νῦν ἔραμαι, where the past—including Hera herself (οὐδὲ σεῦ αὐτῆς, 327)—yields to the present (νῦν) in quality (ὡς), and the other women yield to Hera (σέο, note the change of person) when it comes to love (ἔραμαι).[11]

[11] The opening of Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 1-20 is clearly a variation of this type. The initial ὅσα δὴ δέδηγμαι (1) indicates a large quantity, which is then specified in the following lines (5-16) by a series of alternating examples, culminating in the climax of 17-20:

ἀλλ' οὐδεπώποτ' ἐξ ὅτου 'γὼ ῥύπτομαι
οὕτως ἐδήχθην ὑπὸ κονίας τὰς ὀφρῦς
ὡς νῦν, ὁπότ' οὔσης κυρίας ἐκκλησίας
ἑωθινῆς ἔρημος ἡ πνὺξ *αὑτηί.*

Note the adversative ἀλλ' (17), the οὐδεπώποτ' (17), the evaluative οὕτως ... ὡς (18-19), the climactic νῦν (19), and the deictic αὑτηί (20): all highlighting the importance of the *hic et nunc*. I am indebted to my colleague R. Dale Sweeney for this example. Cf. *Il.* 3.442-446, a shorter version of the same form, where Paris qualifies

A priamel can also be constructed on the relationship between potential and actual facts, where the temporal οὐδ' ὅτε ("not even when") as seen in the above example is replaced by the conditional οὐδ' εἰ ("not even if"). This type is used to impart an oath-like permanence to an assertion, and frequently employs hyperbolic (if not impossible) items as foil. As in the previous example, the form permits a considerable flexibility for expansion or contraction. In the heat of battle at *Od.* 22.61-64, when Eurymachus offers to ransom his life, Odysseus underscores his own resolution with a brief example:[12]

Εὐρύμαχ', *οὐδ' εἴ* μοι πατρώϊα πάντ' ἀποδοῖτε,
ὅσσα τε νῦν ὔμμ' ἐστὶ *καὶ εἴ* ποθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθεῖτε,
οὐδέ κεν *ὥς ἔτι* χεῖρας ἐμὰς λήξαιμι φόνοιο
πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτῖσαι.

But in the leisure of the negotiations in Book 9, Achilles expands the form at length in his rejection of Agamemnon's gifts, and creates one of the most impressive priamels in Homer (*Il.* 9.378-391):[13]

ἐχθρὰ δέ μοι τοῦ δῶρα, τίω δέ μιν ἐν καρὸς αἴσῃ.
οὐδ' εἴ μοι δεκάκις τε καὶ εἰκοσάκις τόσα δοίη
ὅσσα τέ οἱ νῦν ἔστι, καὶ εἴ ποθεν ἄλλα γένοιτο,
οὐδ' ὅσ' ἐς Ὀρχομενὸν ποτινίσεται, οὐδ' ὅσα Θήβας
Αἰγυπτίας, ὅθι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται,
αἵ θ' ἑκατόμπυλοί εἰσι, διηκόσιοι δ' ἀν' ἑκάστας
ἀνέρες ἐξοιχνεῦσι σὺν ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν·
οὐδ' εἴ μοι τόσα δοίη ὅσα ψάμαθός τε κόνις τε,
οὐδέ κεν *ὥς ἔτι* θυμὸν ἐμὸν πείσει' Ἀγαμέμνων,
πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ἐμοὶ δόμεναι θυμαλγέα λώβην.
κούρην δ' οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο,
οὐδ' εἰ χρυσείῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ κάλλος ἐρίζοι,
ἔργα δ' Ἀθηναίῃ γλαυκώπιδι ἰσοφαρίζοι·
οὐδέ μιν ὥς γαμέω·

---

the summary οὐ ... πώ ποτέ with only one example, showing how the basic form of a summary priamel can be expanded *ad libitum*. Naturally Zeus has more experience to boast than Paris.

[12] οὐδὲ ... ἔτι provides a temporal aspect in the climax that is formally equivalent to νῦν. It has a deictic sense: "not from *this time* on," "not *hence*forth." For μηκέτι in the climax of a priamel, cf. Pindar O. 1.5 and 114.

[13] There are two priamels here: 379-387 (in which Achilles refuses to be reconciled with Agamemnon) and 389-391 (in which he refuses to marry Agamemnon's daughter).

This form will have important later imitations.[14]

At *Od.* 5.118-129, Calypso employs a priamel for a forensic purpose, as she accuses the gods of being σχέτλιοι and ζηλήμονες, *whenever* a goddess takes a human lover. After this summary complaint, she expands τις (120) into two specific examples (ὣς μὲν ὅτε, 121; ὣς δ' ὁπότε, 125) and caps them with the present one: ὣς δ' αὖ νῦν μοι ἄγασθε (129).[15]

Σχέτλιοί ἐστε, θεοί, ζηλήμονες ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
οἵ τε θεαῖς ἀγάασθε παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνάζεσθαι
ἀμφαδίην, ἤν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ' ἀκοίτην.
ὣς μὲν ὅτ' Ὠρίων' ἕλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς,
τόφρα οἱ ἠγάασθε θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζώοντες,
ἧος ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἄρτεμις ἁγνὴ
οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνεν.
ὣς δ' ὁπότ' Ἰασίωνι ἐυπλόκαμος Δημήτηρ,
ᾧ θυμῷ εἴξασα, μίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ
νειῷ ἔνι τριπόλῳ· οὐδὲ δὴν ἦεν ἄπυστος
Ζεύς, ὅς μιν κατέπεφνε βαλὼν ἀργῆτι κεραυνῷ.
ὣς δ' αὖ νῦν μοι ἄγασθε, θεοί, βροτὸν ἄνδρα παρεῖναι.

The priamel can also be used for the purpose of consolation, when other instances are cited, so that the suffering person can see that his own pain is not unique. At *Il.* 5.382-384, Dione begins her exhortation to the wounded Aphrodite with a summary statement:

τέτλαθι, τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ·
πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἐξ ἀνδρῶν, χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες.

This alone would be sufficient foil for a summary priamel, but Dione then goes on to specify three examples (385-404), before making her point (405):

σοὶ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀνῆκε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη...

---

[14] In particular Tyrtaeus 12W and Xenophanes 2W. Cf. U. Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) 7-22.

[15] This type of "inductive" priamel, where several instances are adduced to prove the similarity of the present one, is particularly common in contexts where reproach, exhortation, or consolation is intended. In the present example, it is used to accuse; in the following example of Dione's address to Aphrodite, it is used to console; in the following example of Nestor's advice to Antilochus, it is used to exhort. Also pertinent are the examples which T. Krischer lists under his "generalisierende Priamel" (cf. *Intro.* n. 21), and many "didactic" passages in Latin elegy (e.g. Ovid *A.A.* 1.45-50).

Another brief priamel occurs at *Il.* 23.315-318, when Nestor counsels his son to use μῆτις when competing in the chariot-race. The anaphora, which well suits the didactic purpose of the passage, will become a frequent feature of priamels in Latin elegy.[16]

> *μήτι* τοι δρυτόμος μέγ' ἀμείνων ἠὲ βίηφι·
> *μήτι* δ' αὖτε κυβερνήτης ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ
> νῆα θοὴν ἰθύνει ἐρεχθομένην ἀνέμοισι·
> *μήτι δ' ἡνίοχος* περιγίγνεται ἡνιόχοιο.

At *Il.* 9.406-409 Achilles expresses in priamel form the fact that material goods may come and go, but that a man's life is different, thereby emphasizing the unique and precious quality of human life (a subject on which he has been brooding):[17]

> ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,
> κτητοὶ δὲ τρίποδές τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα·
> *ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ* πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λεϊστὴ
> οὔθ' ἑλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν ἀμείψεται ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

During the pursuit of Hector around the walls of Troy, there is a brief priamel of the form *not* A, *nor* B, *but* C,[18] which emphasizes the seriousness of this chase, to all appearances a foot-race (*Il.* 22.158-161):

> πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δέ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων
> καρπαλίμως, ἐπεὶ *οὐχ* ἱερήϊον *οὐδὲ* βοείην
> ἀρνύσθην, ἅ τε ποσσὶν ἀέθλια γίγνεται ἀνδρῶν,
> *ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς* θέον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο.

---

[16] Cf. the charming adaptation of this passage at Ovid *A.A.* 1.3-4:

> arte citae veloque rates remoque moventur,
> arte leves currus: arte regendus amor.

Note the imperatival force of *regendus* in the climax. At *Il.* 1.260-273 Nestor lists heroes of old who used to obey him in order to exhort (*a fortiori*) the present leaders to heed his words: ἀλλὰ πίθεσθε καὶ ὔμμες (274).

[17] Immediately following this passage, Achilles relates the famous "choice" which his mother has told him. The priamel thus helps give poignancy to his decision. Van Otterlo (*Intro.*, n. 9) 164-167 correctly links this priamel with others (Aesch. *Aga.* 1001-1021 and *Supp.* 443-451) which emphasize the preciousness and irrevocability of human life. Cf. *infra* p. 87.

[18] This form is so simple and so basic, that it can become little more than a stylistic mannerism, and lose the force and effectiveness of the priamel. It is, however, the briefest type of "list" priamel, and can have (as in the present example) extraordinary power. The many examples which I have noted (particularly in drama) have been excluded from this study unless they produce an especially striking effect. For another example in Homer, cf. *Od.* 14.222-226, which is a bit more diffuse than the present example. Cf. also Hes. *Op.* 637-638.

Here two specific examples of prizes are cited and then summed up so that they contrast *as a group*[19] (athletics) with the actual sphere of activity (warfare), where the "prize" is the life of Hector.

We will conclude this survey of Homeric priamels with two which stress the *diversity* of human talents. The first occurs at *Od.* 8.167-177. Euryalus has just taunted Odysseus by saying that he does not appear to be an athlete, and in return Odysseus concedes Euryalus' good looks, but denies that he has intelligence to match. And in order to give weight to his claim, Odysseus begins with a general principle (167-168):

οὕτως οὐ *πάντεσσι* θεοὶ χαρίεντα διδοῦσιν
ἀνδράσιν, οὔτε φυὴν οὔτ' ἄρ φρένας οὔτ' ἀγορητύν.

We cannot all have the graces of *both* mind and body.[20] He then gives two examples, before applying the last one to Euryalus (169-177):

ἄλλος μὲν γάρ τ' εἶδος ἀκιδνότερος πέλει ἀνήρ,
ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεσι στέφει, οἱ δέ τ' ἐς αὐτὸν
τερπόμενοι λεύσσουσιν· ὁ δ' ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύει
αἰδοῖ μειλιχίῃ, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν,
ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ θεὸν ὣς εἰσορόωσιν.
ἄλλος δ' αὖ εἶδος μὲν ἀλίγκιος ἀθανάτοισιν,
ἀλλ' οὔ οἱ χάρις ἀμφιπεριστέφεται ἐπέεσσιν,
ὡς *καὶ σοὶ εἶδος* μὲν ἀριπρεπές, οὐδέ κεν ἄλλως
οὐδὲ θεὸς τεύξειε, *νόον δ'* ἀποφώλιός ἐσσι.

A variation of the form occurs at *Il.* 13.729-734, where Polydamas tries to persuade Hector to stop fighting in a disorderly fashion and organize his men. He begins by saying that just because Hector is a great fighter, he also pretends to knowledgeable counsel. His

---

[19] For a summary before the climax, cf. *Intro.*, p. 12 and above, note 3. Here the summary adds considerable force. ποσσίν (160) contrasts with ψυχῆς (161); the generalizing effect of the τε (160) contrasts with this *specific* race; and the general ἀνδρῶν (160) is specified in Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο (161). Vergil's imitation of this passage at *Aen.* 12.764-765 attenuates the Homeric priamel by narrowing the terms of contrast to *praemia* and *vita et sanguine*.

[20] I cannot understand why editors like Stanford, *ad loc.* (p. 336) wish to insert πάντα in line 167. It is not a question of having *all* the graces, but specifically the three in line 168: physical beauty, intelligence, and eloquence. Obvious throughout the permutations of this priamel is the contrast between beauty and speech, until the climactic νόον (177) finally answers οὔτ' ἄρ φρένας (168) in the original catalogue. It is clear that this priamel is complicated by the fact that *combinations* of qualities are being contrasted; typically Greek is the final emphasis on νόος.

mistake, like that of Euryalus, is assuming that the presence or absence of one virtue indicates the same presence or absence of the others as well. Like Odysseus, Polydamas uses a priamel to sketch the various possibilities (729-734):

> ἀλλ' οὔ πως ἅμα *πάντα* δυνήσεαι αὐτὸς ἑλέσθαι.
> ἄλλῳ μὲν γὰρ δῶκε θεὸς πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
> ἄλλῳ δ' ὀρχηστύν, ἑτέρῳ κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδήν,
> *ἄλλῳ* δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τιθεῖ *νόον* εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
> ἐσθλόν, τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἐπαυρίσκοντ' ἄνθρωποι,
> καί τε πολέας ἐσάωσε, *μάλιστα* δὲ καὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.

and, like Odysseus, he singles out νόος (732). Although there is no *initial* indication that the last phrase (732) is indeed the ultimate category, there are other signals. First is the switch from θεός (730) to Zeus (a kind of superlative as well as specification). Also, the amplification of the next two lines (733-734) (with the enjambed ἐσθλόν, 733) breaks the anaphora of the preceding lines. Finally, the superlative μάλιστα (734) and the intensified expression καὐτὸς ἀνέγνω (734) confirm that Polydamas is stressing his special virtue of intelligence before he gives his advice. The fact that he has not drawn a strong contrast between Hector's πολεμήϊα ἔργα (727, 730) and his own νόος (732), particularly by inserting the examples of dancing, cithara-playing, and singing (obvious foil), shows considerable tact on Polydamas' part,[21] and contrasts with the much blunter reply of Odysseus to Euryalus in the previous example.

Summary

Many of the basic forms of priamels (from summary to full lists) are present in Homer and have their *Nachleben* in lyric, elegy, and drama. There is already in Homer a great variety of forms and functions, but whether they are used to praise (*Od.* 24.87-92), to censure (*Od.* 8.167-177), to console (*Il.* 5.382-405), to accuse (*Od.* 5.118-129), to exhort (*Il.* 23.315-318), or to affirm (*Il.* 9.378-391), their common goal is to make the *hic et nunc* more striking by prefacing it with other instances, thereby providing a context for an otherwise flat assertion or naked particular. It is akin to the simile in that it halts the action and provides a reflective stasis; it engages the

---

[21] Cf. the summary form of this topic used by Aeneas at Eur. *Rh.* 106-108. Note the expression ἄλλῳ δ' ἄλλο πρόσκειται γέρας (107), common in such summaries, and especially frequent in Pindar.

mind to contemplate other examples, so as better to appreciate the special character of the present instance; and through vivid examples, contrast, and ὑπεροχή it invites the emotions to participate by recalling related occasions. "Yet I am not so much moved by the coming grief of the Trojans, nor of Hecabe's own, nor of Priam's, nor of my many fallen brothers', as of yours, when..." (*Il.* 6.450-454). It is obvious that the priamel provides a measure of intensity that the bare statement of fact would otherwise lack.

Likewise, during Achilles' pursuit of Hector, the poet could simply have said that they were running quickly because Hector's life was at stake. Or, he could have used a simile (as he does in the following lines, *Il.* 22.162-166) to show how similar to an athletic competition their race was. Instead, he uses a brief priamel, the burden of which is the ἀέθλια (160) for which men compete: not a sacrificial animal, not an ox-hide—these are prizes in foot-races—but for the life of Hector were they running. We are meant to appreciate the comparison of this chase with a foot-race, but at the same time recognize the essential difference: the present race is all the more earnest because the prize is the more precious. This is the advantage which the priamel has over the simile: the latter can only express similarity, while the priamel can also stress differences and provide evaluation.[22]

---

[22] This is not said to depreciate similes, nor to deny them elements of contrast and evaluation in certain instances, but contrast and evaluation are special virtues of priamels. One aspect of the priamel is to give order to an otherwise random or endless list of particulars, and this often includes evaluation, by which one finally arrives at the best, or most important. This motive is so strong in Greek writers, and particularly in Homer, that as soon as he has completed his long catalogue of ships, Homer orders the whole *qualitatively* (*Il.* 2.760-770). And in order to make that judgment, the poet again summons the Muse (761-762), as he had to begin the catalogue. It is important to determine the proper hierarchy, lest we forget in the course of the long list that there is a qualitative difference independent of the number of ships and leaders. Homer begins with the penultimate horses of Eumelus and the warrior Ajax, thus saving for climactic position Achilles and his horses (while making the point at the same time that the Achaeans are now relying on their second-best forces). It is perhaps noteworthy that in the catalogue of Trojan allies Glaucus and Sarpedon are reserved for the last position, although they are not emphatically introduced. There is, of course, a natural tendency for the last thing mentioned in a list to receive emphasis, but Homer has not underscored the point, and it is only in the remainder of the work that it is apparent that they are the most important of the allies.

2. *Hesiod*

Although catalogues abound in the works and fragments of Hesiod, there are surprisingly few priamels, and certainly none of the elaborate types found in Homer (and in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*). It is indeed difficult to determine just why this is the case.[23] Of the three priamels cited by Kröhling (*Op.* 293-297, 689-694, and *fr.* 304 M.-W.), the first two are marginal at best,[24] and the third is an example of the rhetorical form of the κλῖμαξ. Although it is technically a priamel, it is not particularly noteworthy in itself,[25] especially since the context is lost.[26]

3. *The Homeric Hymns*

Nine lines are preserved by Diodorus Siculus (3.66.3) from the beginning of the Homeric *Hymn to Dionysus* concerning the birthplace of the god.[27]

---

[23] Perhaps one observation is appropriate. With only a few exceptions (e.g. *Il.* 2.400-403, 14.394-401, and 22.159-161), the majority of priamels in Homer (and especially the long ones) are found in speeches. The predominance of narrative in the surviving works of Hesiod may help to explain the discrepancy. Furthermore, it should be noted that after Homer priamels are very infrequent in epic poetry, and the two longer priamels in the *Aeneid* (1.607-610 and 6.874-853) both occur in speeches.

[24] The justly famous lines at *Op.* 293-297: οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος ... are reminiscent of priamels in Homer emphasizing diversity of talents, but this one begins with the superlative, and the real point is the application to Perses in the following lines:

ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἡμετέρης μεμνημένος...

In the example at *Op.* 689-694, only a comparison is really involved.

[25] It is noteworthy for the attraction which it held for later imitators such as Ausonius, who in *Ecl.* 5 converts the Hesiodic passage to foil for the duration of the entire universe, a typical example of late authors' "out-doing" of classical writers. Its form is known in German as "Kettenspruch." Cf. Kröhling (*Intro.*, n. 8) 11 and 22.

[26] The priamel which M. L. West (*Intro.*, n. 27) 269 claims to see behind *Op.* 435-436 is, I think, a mere list without any special emphasis on the last item, as West himself implies in his last comment: "The first two of Hesiod's three cola are, of course, not there merely to set off the third, but useful and relevant pieces of advice in their own right." The other examples which he cites are hardly convincing parallels. For two minor priamels, cf. *Op.* 637-638 and 641-642 [a summary priamel urging Perses to do all things (πάντων) in season, but especially (μάλιστα) sailing].

[27] That the question of the god's birthplace occurs very near the beginning of the hymn is confirmed by *h. Hom.* 3.25 ff. and Call. *h. Zeus* 4 ff. In his instructions for a Sminthian hymn to Apollo, Menander the Rhetor treats the birthplace as the second topic after the name; cf. *Rh. Gr.* 3.439.25 ff. Sp.

οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνῳ σ', *οἱ δ'* Ἰκάρῳ ἠνεμοέσσῃ
φάσ', *οἱ δ'* ἐν Νάξῳ, δῖον γένος εἰραφιῶτα,
οἱ δέ σ' *ἐπ'* Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ βαθυδινήεντι
κυσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ,
ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβῃσιν ἄναξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι
ψευδόμενοι· *σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατὴρ* ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
πολλὸν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων κρύπτων λευκώλενον Ἥρην.
ἔστι δέ τις Νύση ὕπατον ὄρος ἀνθέον ὕλῃ
τηλοῦ Φοινίκης σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτοιο ῥοάων

These lines contain an important type of priamel, in which rival claims or opinions are listed and a resolution is proposed in the author's selection of a new claim. It is natural that such differences of opinion should be found in hymns, where cultic aspects of a given divinity are often matters of dispute,[28] but the basic form also occurs in other genres, including lyric, epigram, and even prose.[29]

The passage in question was probably preceded by a rhapsodic question or other indication of ἀπορία, and the γάρ-clause lists the various claims (οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δὲ ... οἱ δὲ ... οἱ δὲ ... ἄλλοι δέ). All of these are bound together syntactically by the delayed σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι (5), and the switch to ἄλλοι helps to set apart the penultimate term. But all of them are abruptly[30] and summarily rejected by the enjambed ψευδόμενοι (6), and the prominent position of σε (6), which until then had been post-positive, indicates that this is the climactic term. The δέ (6) (here = γάρ)[31] explains just why the other claims are false: Dionysus was in fact born πολλὸν ἀπ'

---

[28] Rival centers of a god's worship naturally put forward conflicting claims, and when there are several to choose from, a priamel is a very useful form for selecting the preferred one. The same applies, in rhapsodic hymns, to possible stories which one might tell. Thus the Homeric hymns, and in particular the *Hymn to Apollo* (the most diverse of the Olympians), use priamels to great advantage. The continuity of this tradition is evident even in later periods. Cf. Aristocles *h. Dem.* 1-4 (= Aelian *NA* 11.4), which singles out a particular rite at Hermione, and Aristid. 46.20 K., which imitates elements of *h. Hom.* 3 and culminates in Poseidon's preference for the Isthmus (ὅδε ὁ χῶρος).

[29] e.g. Sappho *fr.* 16, *A.P.* 16.296, and Hdt. 1.1-5, all discussed below.

[30] This abrupt dismissal of foil for the climactic term is not uncommon in later authors, but it is usually in the form of a question, e.g. Pindar P. 10.4 and Bacch. 10.51-52. In his adaptation of this passage at *h. Zeus* 6-9, Callimachus considerably smoothes out the abruptness.

[31] It could be argued that the δέ in σὲ δ' ἔτικτε is merely the normal adversative in the climax of a priamel. But the real force of the adversative is felt in the enjambed ψευδόμενοι, and it seems more natural that this δέ provides the explanation, as well as the contrasting claim of the poet. The concrete choice is finally expressed, climactically, in 8 f. Note the proper name and the superlative ὕπατον (8).

ἀνθρώπων (7). The way is now clear for the poet to give *his* account of the god's birth: ἔστι δέ τις Νύση ... (8). It is important to note that the progression leads from a diverse series of claims to their collective rejection by a shift of the argument,[32] and the final assertion of the new particular claim. A variation of this is found in the epigram ascribed to Antipater Sidonius (*A.P.* 16.296; cf. Ps. Plut. *Vit. Hom.* 87-94 Allen):[33]

> Οἵ μέν σευ Κολοφῶνα τιθηνήτειραν, Ὅμηρε,
> οἵ δὲ καλὰν Σμύρναν, οἵ δ' ἐνέπουσι Χίον,
> οἵ δ' Ἶον, οἵ δ' ἐβόασαν ἐΰκλαρον Σαλαμῖνα,
> οἵ δέ νυ τῶν Λαπιθέων ματέρα Θεσσαλίην·
> *ἄλλοι* δ' *ἄλλην* μαῖαν ἀνίαχον. *εἰ δέ με* Φοίβου
> *χρὴ* λέξαι πινυτὰς ἀμφαδὰ μαντοσύνας,
> πάτρα σοι τελέθει μέγας οὐρανός, ἐκ δὲ τεκούσης
> οὐ θνατᾶς, ματρὸς δ' ἔπλεο Καλλιόπας.

Here the rival claims for the birthplace of Homer are listed (οἵ μὲν ... οἵ δὲ ... οἵ δὲ ... οἵ δὲ ... οἵ δέ) until the catalogue is summed up: ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλην μαῖαν ἀνίαχον (5). The implication is that the list could be extended indefinitely on this level. In contrast, the poet shifts the argument to a new level (note the change of syntax with εἰ δέ, 5 and the change of person with με, 5) by claiming higher authority from Apollo. He can then assert *his* account of Homer's parentage (note the switch back to the hymnal σοι, 7): μέγας οὐρανός and Calliope; meaning, of course, that Homer's universality is not to be confined to one place. The integrity of the priamel's form readily lends itself for use in epigrams, but it is more often used in longer works, and historically its use in epigrams derives undoubtedly from its use in epic and hymnal genres.[34]

A comparison of two passages in the Homeric hymns will help to point out the distinction between a priamel and a simple list. At *h. Hom.* 5.68 f. the poet tells that Aphrodite went to Mt. Ida, the

---

[32] In other examples of this shift to a new level of argument, there is usually a shift to the first person (εἰ δέ με ... χρή at *A.P.* 16.296.5-6; ἐγὼ δέ at Sappho *fr.* 16.4 and Hdt. 1.5.3). It is perhaps due to the more impersonal conventions of the *Homeric Hymns* that the third and second persons are maintained.

[33] Cf. also *A.P.* 16.295 for a variation (also a priamel) on the same subject, where a negative list is rejected by a γάρ-clause, and the climax signalled with ἀλλά (7).

[34] This disproves any attempt to find the origin of Greek priamels in popular (*volkstümlich*) epigrammatic improvisation.

mother of wild animals, and proceeds to give a short list of the beasts that followed her (68-72):

> Ἴδην δ' ἵκανεν πολυπίδακα, μητέρα θηρῶν,
> βῆ δ' ἰθὺς σταθμοῖο δι' οὔρεος· οἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν
> σαίνοντες πολιοί τε λύκοι χαροποί τε λέοντες
> ἄρκτοι παρδάλιές τε θοαὶ προκάδων ἀκόρητοι
> ἤϊσαν·

The list does not reach a climax, no one animal is more important than another, nor are the animals themselves contrasted with or compared to something else. The point of the list is to impart particularlity to Aphrodite's actions by specifying the θηρῶν (68). At first glance the list of flowers in the meadow where Persephone is playing is also just verisimilar enumeration (*h. Hom.* 2.6-8):

> ἄνθεά τ' αἰνυμένην ῥόδα καὶ κρόκον ἠδ' ἴα καλὰ
> λειμῶν' ἂμ μαλακὸν καὶ ἀγαλλίδας ἠδ' ὑάκινθον
> *νάρκισσόν* θ', ὃν φῦσε δόλον...

but in line 8 the catalogue suddenly ends, and the enjambed νάρκισσον is singled out by the following relative clause as the real point of interest, for it was *this* flower which stood out from all the rest, and which occasioned the rape. The following lines (10-14) amplify the appeal of the flower (θαυμαστόν, 10; σέβας, 10; and ἥδιστ', 13 provide the superlative motif common in the climax of a priamel). In contrast to the list of animals, the "other" flowers are obviously foil for the final one.

Later in the same hymn, when Persephone recounts her adventure, the list of flowers again appears (in different form), and as in the first case, it culminates in the fatal narcissus, which is singled out by a brief relative clause (425-428):

> παίζομεν ἠδ' ἄνθεα δρέπομεν χείρεσσ' ἐρόεντα,
> μίγδα κρόκον τ' ἀγανὸν καὶ ἀγαλλίδας ἠδ' ὑάκινθον
> καὶ ῥοδέας κάλυκας καὶ λείρια, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι,
> *νάρκισσόν* θ' ὃν ἔφυσ' ὥς περ κρόκον εὐρεῖα χθών.

The poet has subtly altered the form of the priamel, not only for the sake of *variatio*, but because the narrator is different. At the opening of the hymn, there was leisure to expatiate on the special narcissus; here, from Persephone's perspective, its attraction was the fact that it was "yellow as a crocus," and we proceed quickly to its picking: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ δρεπόμην (429). The words θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι (427), which (in slightly different form) were used in the climax of the first example

(10), here are used to set off the previous flowers *as a group* from the particular narcissus.[35] The implication is that the other flowers were marvelous enough, but more so was the narcissus, and it was this which was Persephone's undoing.[36]

It is, however, in one hymn that the majority of priamels is to be found, and their use is so sophisticated and so striking that it is worthwhile to examine them in detail, even though attention has frequently been called to them.[37] In fact, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* is built of priamels.

After the introduction of Apollo τοξοφόρος and the congratulations to Leto for bearing Apollo and Artemis (1-18), the poet begins a new section with the rhapsodic question (19):

Πῶς γάρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὔυμνον ἐόντα;

The adjective εὔυμνον (reinforced by πάντως) indicates the great amount of song which Apollo enjoys.[38] This abundance provides

[35] In lines 418-424 Persephone lists the girls who were playing with her in the meadow (expanding πᾶσαι, 417). At first glance this list seems to have no real purpose: there is no climactic term, nor is any one girl singled out. They are collectively described as ἡμεῖς μὲν μάλα πᾶσαι ... παίζομεν (417-425), and the list of flowers they were picking is given in different form in 426-428, but like its former example, it too culminates in the fatal narcissus, which is singled out by a relative clause as special ("yellow as a crocus"). Then comes the climactic line: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ δρεπόμην ... (429), and we can see that although the list of her playmates is not cast in the form of a priamel, we are nevertheless meant to see that *all* of them were playing together, and were picking all kinds of flowers (which were wonderful to behold, 427), *but* (αὐτάρ, 429) it was the narcissus that Persephone picked, and it was she whom Hades raped. Thus the list of names of the playmates, like the list of flowers, not only gives verisimilitude to the picture, but it also serves by contrast to emphasize the lone Persephone, who *is* singled out.

[36] Cf. Moschus 2 ("Europe") 63-71, where the summary ἄλλη ἐπ' ἀλλοίοισι τότ' ἄνθεσι θυμὸν ἔτερπον (64) is expanded into a list of girls and flowers, which culminates (ἀτάρ, 69) in the queen and the rose. Note the superlative in διέπρεπεν (71).

[37] Cf. F. Dornseiff (*Intro.*, n. 5) 3-12, W. Kröhling (*Intro.*, n. 8) 58-59, 68-69, and most recently A. M. Miller, "The 'Address to the Delian Maidens' in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: Epilogue or Transition?" TAPA 109 (1979) 184-185 carefully examines the priamel of lines 19-28. Cf. also Bundy (1972) 61-63 for an analysis of 19-26, 140-155, and 207-216 in relation to the greater hymnal tradition.

[38] For εὔυμνος at the beginning of hymns, cf. Call. *h. Apol.* 31 and *h. Del.* 4. The summary motif is neatly provided by πάντως (19) in *all* ways. Such a rhapsodic question may have preceded the priamel at *h. Hom.* 1.1 ff. Cf. the function of γάρ at *h. Hom.* 1.1. and at *h. Hom.* 3.20. The analysis of T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford 1936) 203 is as just an appreciation of the point of the priamel as one could be (without actually calling it such): "19-24 are a prooemium stating the universality of Apollo's sphere, and choosing out of it Delos in particular for celebration."

the basis of the priamel, and just as diversity at *h. Hom.* 1.1-9 eventually led to one item, so here the poet, faced with a plethora of themes, must select one of them. But before one is selected, he sketches the extent of song which Apollo is wont to receive—not as one would expect from πῶς (19), a list of *themes* (as later in lines 208-213), but a list of *places* (20-27):

πάντῃ γάρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομὸς βεβλήαται ᾠδῆς,
ἠμὲν ἀν' ἤπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἠδ' ἀνὰ νήσους.
πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαί τοι ἅδον καὶ πρώονες ἄκροι
ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ποταμοί θ' ἅλα δὲ προρέοντες,
ἀκταί τ' εἰς ἅλα κεκλιμέναι λιμένες τε θαλάσσης.
ἦ ὥς σε πρῶτον Λητὼ τέκε χάρμα βροτοῖσι,
κλινθεῖσα πρὸς Κύνθου ὄρος κραναῇ ἐνὶ νήσῳ
Δήλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ; ἑκάτερθε δὲ κῦμα κελαινὸν
ἐξῄει χέρσον δὲ λιγυπνοίοις ἀνέμοισιν·
ἔνθεν ἀπορνύμενος πᾶσι θνητοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις.

The first word (πάντῃ, 20) is expanded into a list of topographical features: mainland and islands, peaks, mountainsides, rivers, beaches, and harbors. These are then followed by the single question: ἦ ὥς σε πρῶτον Λητὼ τέκε ... (25).[39] Although the interrogative form gives a tentative cast to these lines, they in fact constitute the climax of the priamel. There is not the common adversative as a signal, and the logic appears less than straightforward, but there are other indications that the priamel is concluded here. First is the pronoun σε, placed as far forward as it can be; second is the superlative πρῶτον; third is the theme of birth, which has been foreshadowed in the felicitation of Leto in lines 14-18;[40] fourth is the name of Leto (25) and especially of Δήλῳ (27), which has been withheld for climactic effect (at the beginning of the line); fifth is the amplification of 27-28, culminating in line 29:

[39] This is hardly the place to engage in a lengthy excursus, but it seems most likely that line 25 is interrogative, and should be punctuated as ἦ ὡς on the analogy of line 214 and Call. *h. Del.* 30 (which is a direct imitation of this passage). Lines 20-24 have sketched many other possible places as themes, and it would be superfluous to list even more. The poet comes right to the point, but at the same time maintains the disjunctive form (and the modesty) by putting it in interrogative form. I know of no other example where ἦ signals a climax of a priamel. For other examples of disjunctive hymnal priamels, cf. Pindar *fr.* 29 and I. 7.1 ff., and Bundy (1962) 45 n. 32.

[40] It would, of course, be ungracious not to sing of Leto after the lavish congratulations to her in lines 5-18. The hesitation displayed in the priamel 19-25 is purely rhetorical (in the good sense), designed to amplify this one theme among so many others.

ἔνθεν ἀπορνύμενος πᾶσι θνητοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις.

It is clear that the ὡς (25) specifies the indefinite πῶς (19), just as Κύνθου ὄρος (26) specifies ὀρέων (23) and Δήλῳ (27) specifies νήσους (21). From this wealth of song and all these places dear (cf. ἄδον, 22) to the god, the poet has selected the theme of his birth,[41] and the *place* Delos, the origin from which he came to rule all men. It finally becomes apparent why the poet provided *places* rather than *themes* as foil; he has slightly skewed the straightforward form of the priamel, but not out of clumsiness—it is an extremely sophisticated passage.[42]

The subtle maneuvers of the previous priamel are matched in the succeeding lines, which contain one of the most delightful surprises in Greek literature. Having concluded the above priamel with the ringing line 29 (quoted above), the poet continues with a long list, ostensibly elaborating the words "all men" (πᾶσι θνητοῖσιν) by cataloguing the extent of Apollo's *dynamis* (30 ff.):

ὅσσους Κρήτη τ' ἐντὸς ἔχει καὶ δῆμος 'Αθηνῶν ...

It is not, however, until line 45 that we realize the fact that the list is doing double duty. What began as an impressive list of places where Apollo *now* holds sway, is suddenly converted into foil as a list of places which *then* (πρῶτον) rejected the pregnant Leto (45-49):[43]

τόσσον ἔπ' ὠδίνουσα 'Εκηβόλον ἵκετο Λητώ,
εἴ τίς οἱ γαιέων υἱεῖ θέλοι οἰκία θέσθαι.
αἱ δὲ μάλ' ἐτρόμεον καὶ ἐδείδισαν, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
Φοῖβον δέξασθαι καὶ πιοτέρη περ ἐοῦσα
πρίν γ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐπὶ *Δήλου* ἐβήσετο πότνια Λητώ...

These places, even though rich, were afraid to receive the new god. The climax of this priamel comes with the words: πρίν γ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐπὶ

[41] On the location of the topic of birth at the beginning of a hymn, cf. above, note 27.

[42] Cf. the analysis of A. M. Miller (above, note 37). Another sophisticated passage in which a disjunctive list of places (here rivers) finally culminates in the desired subject of this "hymn" occurs at Tibullus 1.7.13-23.

[43] Dornseiff (*Intro*. n. 5) 5 n. 1 suggests *Scutum* 393-401 as a possible analogue, but more striking is the famous Homeric simile at *Od*. 23.233-240, which describes the joy of shipwrecked men who have reached shore after great peril—ostensibly applying to Odysseus—but which concludes with an unforeseen reversal (239):

ὣς ἄρα τῇ ἀσπαστὸς ἔην πόσις εἰσοροώσῃ.

Cf. also the simile at *Od*. 5.432-435.

Δήλου (49).[44] When the second function of the list is realized, we grasp the consummate skill with which the priamel provides a wide background of rich "other" places to contrast with the humble Delos, and emphasize the *extent* of Leto's πάθος and the ethical greatness of the humble Delos, the Bethlehem of the Greek world, the only place that dared to risk the little that it had to welcome the new god. In short, the priamel amplifies the eventual power of Apollo, and dramatically makes us relive the long journey of the suffering suppliant, Leto.

There is a natural relationship between a priamel and a journey,[45] for each arrives, through a series, at a final point or destination.[46] The poet of the hymn was obviously enamored of this form of priamel, since he uses it two more times in the poem. Lines 216-282 (with the paradigmatic "digression" at Telphousa in lines 244-276) recount the journey of Apollo in search of a location for his oracle, and lines 409-438 describe the journey of the Cretan merchants to Apollo's new shrine at Delphi.

In lines 140 ff. the poet varies the priamel which he had used at 19-27. There he was selecting the theme of Apollo's birth on Delos; here he uses a variation of the same form to focus once again on Delos, but this time for a different purpose: to introduce the Ionian festival:

> Αὐτὸς δ' ἀργυρότοξε ἄναξ ἑκατηβόλ' Ἄπολλον,
> *ἄλλοτε* μέν τ' ἐπὶ Κύνθου ἐβήσαο παιπαλόεντος,
> *ἄλλοτε* δ' ἂν νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἠλάσκαζες.

---

[44] Note how the particles reinforce the sense of climax. This passage is undoubtedly modeled on *Il.* 9.588.

[45] Both are aspects of ζήτησις. Cf. the "journeys" at Theogn. 783-788 (*infra* p. 70) and Keats' sonnet "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer":

> *Much* have I travell'd in the realms of gold,
> And *many* goodly states and kingdoms seen;
> Round *many* western islands have I been
> Which bards in fealty to Apollo hold.
> *Oft* of one wide expanse had I been told
> That deep-brow'd Homer ruled as his demesne;
> *Yet* did I never breathe its pure serene
> *Till* I heard Chapman speak out loud and bold...

The geographical amplification is similar to the foil in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*, and *Till* is a nice equivalent of πρίν γ' ὅτε δή.

[46] For other "journeys" with aspects of priamels (arrival at the *hic et nunc*) in drama, cf. the relay of the signal fires at Aesch. *Aga.* 281-312; the journey of Dionysus at Eur. *Bacch.* 13-20; and the search of Apollo at Soph. *Ichn.* 13 ff. (Page, LP no. 7, p. 30).

πολλοί τοι νηοί τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήεντα,
πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαί τε φίλαι καὶ πρώονες ἄκροι
ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ποταμοί θ' ἅλα δὲ προρέοντες·
ἀλλὰ σὺ Δήλῳ Φοῖβε μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπεαι ἦτορ,
ἔνθα τοι ἑλκεχίτωνες Ἰάονες ἠγερέθονται
αὐτοῖς σὺν παίδεσσι καὶ αἰδοίῃς ἀλόχοισιν.
οἱ δέ σε πυγμαχίῃ τε καὶ ὀρχηθμῷ καὶ ἀοιδῇ
μνησάμενοι τέρπουσιν ὅταν στήσωνται ἀγῶνα.
φαίη κ' ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀγήρως ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ
ὃς τότ' ἐπαντιάσει' ὅτ' Ἰάονες ἀθρόοι εἶεν·

The motif of the journey is present here as well (ἐβήσαο, 141). The travels of the god are summarily described: ἄλλοτε μὲν...ἄλλοτε δέ; πολλοί...πᾶσαι, and the same topographical features which occurred in 22-23 are listed, but here the climax singles out Apollo's delight in Delos (146):

ἀλλὰ σὺ Δήλῳ Φοῖβε μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπεαι ἦτορ

With the possible exception of ἦτορ, each word in this line reinforces the sense of climax. The adversative ἀλλά dismisses the "other" places; the prominent σύ marks this statement as particularly important to the god; the particular name Δήλῳ specifies what had remained abstract in the foil, and clearly announces the subject of interest; the cult-name Φοῖβε not only reinforces the σύ, but encloses, as it were, Delos within Apollo's name; the μάλιστα provides the climactic superlative; and ἐπιτέρπεαι (ἦτορ) defines the precise relationship between Delos and Apollo and specifies the word φίλαι (144) in the foil.[47] Out of all this quantity and variety has emerged the specific place which is dearest to Apollo: Delos; but the poet has yet to single out just what aspect of Delos it is that pleases the god. The following clause specifies that it is the Delian festival which delights him: ἔνθα τοι ... σε ... τέρπουσιν.[48] The poet himself takes obvious pleasure in describing the splendor of the festival, but the process of specification continues, as the hymnist singles out the

[47] Cf. Bundy (1972) 62 n. 65 for a summary of this passage and a recognition that the "pleasure" of the god is the ruling principle in this priamel. Cf. also τοι θυμῆρες (= ἐπιτέρπεαι ἦτορ) at Call. *h. Del.* 29.

[48] It is notable that there is a slight climax in the list of events in 149, ending as it does with ἀοιδῇ, which eventually is the most important aspect of the festival. It does not, however, constitute a priamel in the sense in which we have defined it, although it obviously is related, because there is so little emphasis on the final term that the others are barely felt as foil, if at all. On the importance in general of the "*letztgenannte Glied,*" cf. H. Fränkel (*Intro.*, n. 4) 95 and Bundy (1972) 78.

most impressive aspect of the festival. In lines 153-157 he begins yet another priamel:

> *πάντων* γάρ κεν ἴδοιτο χάριν, τέρψαιτο δὲ θυμὸν
> ἄνδρας τ' εἰσορόων καλλιζώνους τε γυναῖκας
> νῆάς τ' ὠκείας ἠδ' αὐτῶν κτήματα *πολλά*.
> *πρὸς δὲ τόδε μέγα θαῦμα*, ὅου κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται,
> κοῦραι Δηλιάδες Ἑκατηβελέταο θεράπναι·

The motif of pleasure is still guiding this priamel (cf. lines 144, 146, 150, 153, 161), and here the splendor of all those gathered Ionians (πάντων, 153) the men, women, ships, and their many (πολλά, 155) possessions is capped (πρὸς δέ, 156) by *this* great wonder (τόδε μέγα θαῦμα, 156 intensifies χάριν, 153), whose fame will never die: Apollo's Delian maidens, who *charm* the races of men.

A brief résumé will show how the poet has used the form of the priamel to "focus" on the highlight of the Delian festival by a series of particularizations. "Although Apollo delights in *all* parts of the world, he especially enjoys Delos, when the Ionians gather in *all* their splendor, and *in addition* there is the great marvel of the Delian maidens' song." Their singing, which has now become the burden of the hymn, can be elaborately described and complimented (in a relative clause beginning in 158 and extending to 176) before the poet takes leave of them to return to the god.[49]

Just as he had used a priamel in 19-27 to spotlight Apollo's birth on Delos, so he varies the form in 207-220 in order to choose his theme in celebration of Pythian Apollo. It begins with the same rhapsodic question (207):

> πῶς τ' ἄρ σ' ὑμνήσω *πάντως εὔυμνον* ἐόντα;
> ἠέ σ' ἐνὶ μνηστῆσιν ἀείδω καὶ φιλότητι
> ὅππως μνωόμενος ἔκιες 'Αζαντίδα κούρην
> Ἴσχυ' ἅμ' ἀντιθέῳ 'Ελατιονίδῃ εὐίππῳ;
> ἢ ἅμα Φόρβαντι Τριοπέῳ γένος, ἢ ἅμ' 'Ερευθεῖ;
> ἢ ἅμα Λευκίππῳ καὶ Λευκίπποιο δάμαρτι
> πεζός, ὁ δ' ἵπποισιν; οὐ μὴν Τρίοπός γ' ἐνέλειπεν.
> *ἢ ὡς τὸ πρῶτον χρηστήριον* ἀνθρώποισι
> ζητεύων κατὰ γαῖαν ἔβης ἑκατηβόλ' Ἄπολλον;

---

[49] That lines 177-178 constitute a return to the *main* theme of the hymn (i.e. Apollo) is ably demonstrated by A. M. Miller (above, note 37). For a brief analysis of this passage in relation to other digressions, cf. "Some Digressions and Returns in Greek Authors," *CJ* 76 (1980) 1-8.

But here, instead of geographical amplification fulfilling the quantitative aspect of the priamel, possible themes are listed in usual rhapsodic style with several disjunctives (ἤ).[50] It will be noticed that the list which follows (208-213, some of which has been lost) is in actuality an elaboration of one type of subject: they are all shared amorous adventures,[51] which, though many in number, are contrasted *en masse* by a totally different theme,[52] the solitary founding of his oracle at Delphi. Once again, the ὡς (214) specifies the πῶς (207)—the ὅππως (209) is bypassed—and the superlative τὸ πρῶτον (214), immediately followed by the new subject (χρηστήριον, 214), indicates the climax of the priamel. There is, however, one aspect of the foil, which is retained in the new subject: the journey. The amorous travels of Apollo to woo his brides (μνωόμενος ἔκιες, 209) are replaced by his travels to found an oracle for men (ζητεύων ... ἔβης, 215). And just as the journey of Leto, which culminated in her arrival at Delos, directly followed upon the priamel of 19-29, so here Apollo's journey follows directly upon this priamel, until he finally reaches Delphi.

Thus, we have seen, the author of the hymn skillfully uses three priamels to introduce major themes (19-27, 140-146, and 207-215), three priamels as "journeys" (30-46, 216-282, and 409-438) to lend

---

[50] Cf. above, note 39. Such a procedure is, of course, akin to *praeteritio*. Cf. among many Latin examples Ovid, *Fasti* 3.713-726, which rejects several possible stories to tell of Dionysus, and is a parody of hymnal style. For prose examples, cf. Hyperides, *Epitaph.* 6-9, and Dem. *de Cor.* 129-130, where the misdeeds of the parents are rejected (ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐάσω, 130) in favor of the things Aeschines *himself* did. Cf. the priamel at Men. Rh. 438.11-27 (esp. ταῦτα μὲν ... παραλείπω, 24-25).

[51] The "amours" of Apollo, and in particular his pursuit of Daphne, were popular themes and formed the basis of later school exercises. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* (*Rh. Gr.* 2.28.5-32.18, Sp.).

[52] Many priamels are so arranged that the foil contains a unifying principle, which allows the poet to reject all the items as a group. Cf. *h. Hom.* 1.1-7 (and the related examples mentioned above, note 29), Dem. *de Cor.* 129-130, and Sonnet 91 of Shakespeare [noted by Nisbet & Hubbard, (*Intro.*, n. 19) 3]:

Some glory in their birth, some in their skill,
Some in their wealth, some in their body's force,
Some in their garments, though newfangled ill,
Some in their hawks and hounds, some in their horse.
And every humor hath his adjunct pleasure,
Wherein it finds a joy above the rest.
But these particulars are not my measure,
All these I better in one general best...

Note the summary in lines 5-6, before the poet presents a new principle which rejects them *en masse* ("all these," 8). Cf. also τοῖς μέν at Ibycus 3.46D (282 PMG).

verisimilitude and *pathos* to his narrative, and one (149-157) to build to a climactic introduction of the Delian maidens. It is interesting to note that this is the only hymn in the collection which exhibits such a striking use of the priamel.

B. THE LYRIC POETS

1. *Alcman*

Although there is a considerable number of priamels in the Homeric corpus, it is in the lyric poets that the form realizes its greatest variety. There are examples throughout the various authors and types, and as early as Alcman's *Partheneion*. The most noted priamel, of which there has been considerable discussion,[53] occurs in lines 92-99. Page[54] construes the passage to mean: "The trace-horse steers the yoke-horses and chariot, the helmsman steers the ship: these are obviously metaphors, or similes, for Hagesichora, who steers and leads the Chorus," and draws attention to *Il.* 23.316-318, which, although a priamel (cf. *supra* p. 39) bears very little resemblance to the passage in Alcman, either in form or in function. As Page paraphrases the passage, it is indeed a priamel, but I find too many difficulties in the text to be certain of his interpretation. In particular, the word μάλιστ' (95) is irregular, and the climax (ἁ δὲ...ἀείδει, 96-99)—if indeed it is a climax—is most unusual.

But there is another priamel in the same poem, which, as far as I know, has gone unnoticed. In lines 64-77, the chorus wants to stress the importance of Hagesichora to their endeavor, and to accomplish this there is a long list of negative terms (*negative Reihung*) which are obviously foil:

οὔτε γάρ τι πορφύρας
τόσσος κόρος ὥστ' ἀμύναι,
οὔτε ποικίλος δράκων
παγχρύσιος, οὐδὲ μίτρα
Λυδία, νεανίδων
ἰανογ[λ]εφάρων ἄγαλμα,
οὐδὲ ταὶ Ναννῶς κόμαι,

[53] Cf. Van Otterlo (*Intro.*, n. 9) 148-153 and Dornseiff (*Intro.*, n. 7).
[54] D. L. Page, *Alcman, The Partheneion* (Oxford 1951) 96.

ἀλλ' οὐ[δ'] Ἀρέτα σιειδής,
οὐδὲ Σύλακίς τε καὶ Κλεησισήρα,
οὐδ' ἐς Αἰνησιμβρ[ό]τας ἐνθοῖσα φασεῖς·
Ἀσταφίς [τ]έ μοι γένοιτο
καὶ ποτιγλέποι Φίλυλλα
Δαμαρ[έ]τα τ' ἐρατά τε Ϝιανθεμίς·
ἀλλ' Ἁγησιχόρα με τείρει.

The fact that these lines comprise an entire strophe helps to reinforce the unity of the priamel, and the abundance (κόρος, 65) of purple, golden snake,[55] Lydian cap, and the charms of Nanno, Areta, Thylacis, Cleësithera, Astaphis, Philylla, Damareta, Ianthemis—and even Aenesimbrota[56] are foil for the climax of the list (77):

ἀλλ' Ἁγησιχόρα με τείρει.

Here the adversative ἀλλά, the prominent name of Hagesichora, and the pronoun με all give closure to the priamel and point up the worth of the choirmistress, whose praises are continued in the following lines.

There is one more priamel of note in the remains of Alcman: *fr.* 16 (PMG), which, according to Stephanus of Byzantium, was ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ δευτέρου τῶν παρθενείων ᾀσμάτων:[57]

οὐκ ἧς ἀνὴρ ἀγρεῖος οὐ-
δὲ σκαιὸς οὐδὲ †παρὰ σοφοῖ-
σιν† οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς γένος,
Ἐρυσιχαῖος οὐδὲ ποιμήν,
ἀλλὰ Σαρδίων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν.

---

[55] Purple and gold (as symbols of wealth in general) are also present in the foil of Bacch. *fr.* 21:

οὐ βοῶν πάρεστι σώματ', *οὔτε* χρυσός,
οὔτε πορφύρεοι τάπητες,
ἀλλὰ θυμὸς εὐμενής,
Μοῦσά τε γλυκεῖα, καὶ Βοιωτίοισιν
ἐν σκύφοισιν οἶνος ἡδύς.

[56] Note the remarkable *variatio* in the presentation of this list. The ἀλλά (71) (not the usual rejection of foil as at 77) indicates a new movement, a heightening with a shift from external adornment to individuals.

[57] D. Gerber, *Euterpe* (Amsterdam 1970) 93 notes that the form of this fragment is similar to *fr.* 1.64-77, and Van Otterlo (*Intro.*, n. 9) 172 links it with other "*negative Reihen*" such as in Archilochus 19W (= 22D), 114W (= 60D), and Anacreon 8D (= 361 PMG).

Although far less elaborate than the previous example, it too has a list of negative examples (οὐκ...οὐδὲ...οὐδὲ...), and introduces the brief climax with ἀλλά. In contrast to the list of places and occupations, Sardis becomes all the more splendid (and sophisticated): Σαρδίων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν.

2. *Archilochus*

There are three very different examples of negative foil in the tantalizing fragments of Archilochus. This variety may be due to the fact that they are in three different meters. Fr. 19W, the only certain priamel, is unfortunately incomplete:

> "οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει,
> οὐδ' εἷλέ πώ με ζῆλος, οὐδ' ἀγαίομαι
> θεῶν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἐρέω τυραννίδος·
> ἀπόπροθεν γάρ ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν."

It would presumably be capped after the summary γάρ-clause by the speaker's own choice of what Plutarch calls τὰ καθ' ἑαυτούς.[58]

Fr. 114W is a borderline case, which demonstrates the difficulty of any strict definition of a priamel.

> οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον
> οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,
> *ἀλλά* μοι σμικρός τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν
> ῥοικός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκὼς ποσσί, καρδίης πλέως.

Krischer denies that this is a priamel, since only two types of generals are contrasted.[59] From that point of view, there is a simple

---

[58] Cf. Plut. *de Tran. An.* 470B. For a discussion of its form in connection with the related priamels, cf. D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar, A Literary Study of Pythian* 11, *Pythian* 3, *and Olympian* 7, *Mnem. Suppl.* 9 (Leiden 1968) 10-11. Note that the γάρ-clause rejects the preceding terms *as a group* on the principle that they are too "remote." Gregory of Nazianzus, *ad Animam Suam* 84 ff., which is often cited as imitating Archilochus 22D and Anacreon 8D, is very dissimilar. It is indeed a priamel, but its choice of foil (lines 77-92, summarized in 93-95 = PG 37.975-977) is entirely different, and the climax is (96-97):

> *μοῦνον* ἐμοὶ φίλον ἔσκε λόγων κλέος, οὓς συνάγειραν
> 'Αντολίη τε δύσις τε καὶ 'Ελλάδος εὖχος 'Αθῆναι.

[59] Cf. T. Krischer (*Intro.*, n. 18) 84. He makes the same objection to *Od.* 14.222-228, which, as in the case of Archilochus fr. 114W could be argued both ways. His point is well taken, but it should be noted that if it is applied too rigorously, then the same objections could be brought against Sappho *fr.* 16.1-3, since the point of issue is really only about three aspects of στρότον (1). Clearly there is a *sense* of plurality in these examples, even though strictly speaking only two things are really being contrasted.

contrast, and perhaps that might suffice: "I don't like A, but let me have B." But there is also a *sense* in which this has the force of a priamel, particularly in the formal structure: οὐ ... οὐδὲ ... οὐδὲ ... οὐδέ followed by ἀλλά μοι, and in the way that the list of attributes is ultimately completed with interior spirit: καρδίης πλέως (4). I would prefer to say that Archilochus adapts some of the features of the priamel in order to make a contrast more striking by enumerating details (a form of λεπτολογία).

Another adaptation of the priamel form occurs in *fr.* 3W:

> οὔτοι *πόλλ'* ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται, οὐδὲ *θαμειαὶ*
> σφενδόναι, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγηι
> ἐν πεδίωι· *ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·*
> ταύτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δάμονές εἰσι μάχης
> δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.

In order to emphasize the fact that the fighting will be at close range, the poet lists two items of foil (οὔτοι ... τόξα ... οὐδὲ ... σφενδόναι). The climax is signalled by the prominent ξιφέων (note the change of case) and the adversative δέ. There is also a subtle contrast between the many (πολλά) bows and the dense (θαμειαί) slings and the very woeful combat (πολύστονον ... ἔργον) with swords, a contrast, ultimately, between quantity and quality.

3. *Tyrtaeus*

One of the best-known priamels is at the beginning of *fr.* 9 (12W):

> οὔτ' ἂν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγωι ἄνδρα τιθείην
> οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης,
> οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθός τε βίην τε,
> νικώιη δὲ θέων Θρηΐκιον Βορέην,
> οὐδ' εἰ Τιθωνοῖο φυὴν χαριέστερος εἴη,
> πλουτοίη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,
> οὐδ' εἰ Ταντολίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη,
> γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,
> οὐδ' εἰ *πᾶσαν* ἔχοι δόξαν *πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς·*

This poem has been thoroughly discussed elsewhere,[60] so it should suffice merely to point out the salient features of the priamel. The

[60] Cf. W. Jaeger, "Tyrtaios, Uber die wahre ἀρετή," SB Berlin (1932) 537-568, and especially U. Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) 1-6. Schmid also deals extensively with Plato's reording of Tyrtaeus' ἀρεταί at *Laws* 660e2-661c5 in pp. 27-33. Cf. also E. Voegelin, *The World of the Polis* (Baton Rouge 1957) 188-194.

list of hyperbolic statements introduced by οὐδ' εἰ + optative is reminiscent of Achilles' refusal of Agamemnon's gifts at *Il.* 9.378-391, and adds considerable emphasis to the climax. As frequently happens in priamels when the list becomes particularly long, the poet sums up (or generalizes) the foil so that the contrasting term will be more emphatic. Having listed athletic ability, strength, speed, beauty, wealth, kingship, and eloquence, he concludes the catalogue with οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν (9)[61] before naming the long-delayed ἀρετή *sine qua non*, "furious valor." This passage admirably demonstrates the ability of the priamel not only to order experience, but also—and this is its poetic quality—to involve the emotions through concrete illustration. The primary function of this priamel is to provide a hierarchy of ἀρεταί by discovering the essential one, or as Tyrtaeus puts it, the truly "memorable" one (cf. μνησαίμην, 1; ἐν λόγῳ, 1; κλέος, 31; etc.). The other virtues take second place to this one. And yet, the point which he makes can easily be summarized by combining lines 1 and 9 in the following fashion:

> Οὔτ' ἂν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγωι ἄνδρα τιθείην...
> οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς.

Everything in between is not essential to the strict *logic* of the passage, but it does contribute to the rhetorical effectiveness of the argument by arousing πάθος in the listeners and attesting to the ἦθος of the speaker.[62] These two elements are not completely separable. On the one hand, our emotions are aroused by the anaphoric rejection of these desirable attainments—all the more so, when they are expressed hyperbolically—and a great suspense is created as the listener waits to find out just what "tops" the seemingly unsurpassable.[63] On the other hand, the oath-like quality of this list, which never hedges, but states the case in its most extreme instances, attests (as it does in the case of Achilles in *Il.* 9) to the speaker's character: here is a man who has considered all the ἀρεταί

---

[61] Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) labels this the "πάντα-Wert" motif; we have shown that it is part of a general tendency to sum up the foil before the climax. Here πᾶσαν δόξαν means "all (manner of) reputation," and, as C. Prato, *Tyrtaeus* (Rome 1968) 128 points out, "sintetizza, certo, in una parola, le ἀρεταί precedentemente enumerate, ma senza escludere le altre, che il poeta non nomina per brevità."

[62] Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1.2.3.1356a1 ff.

[63] On amplification and the *supra summum adiectio*, cf. Quint. 8.4.3-6.

at their greatest potential, and can state unequivocally that they are not as important as θοῦρις ἀλκή. He has, in short, established his credentials to make such a claim.

We have often noted the presence of superlatives in the climax; here, as in many cases, the confirmation which follows the process of selection provides many of the motifs otherwise found in the climax. After the γάρ-clause of the following three lines, the deictic and superlative elements appear (13-14):

ἥδ' ἀρετή, *τόδ'* ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν *ἄριστον*
κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίνεται ἀνδρὶ νέωι.

Once the priamel has done its work, the poet is free to expatiate at great length on the benefits of his "furious valor" (15-42),[64] and end with an exhortation to "any man" to excel in this ἀρετή (43-44).

4. *Xenophanes*

The similarities of Xenophanes 2W and Tyrtaeus 12W are at first glance striking. Each begins with a list consisting of εἰ + optative which leads up to the particular claim of the poet (held until the end of the line for climactic effect). There are other similarities: each list begins with the example of swift feet, and the catalogues are both summed up with a form of πᾶς before the climactic term is announced. Each poet then goes on to confirm his choice as beneficial to the state. But beyond this, the differences of form and content are more telling than the similarities.

ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν νίκην τις ἄροιτο
ἢ πενταθλεύων, ἔνθα Διὸς τέμενος
πὰρ Πίσαο ῥοῇς ἐν 'Ολυμπίηι, εἴτε παλαίων
ἢ καὶ πυκτοσύνην ἀλγινόεσσαν ἔχων
εἴτε τὸ δεινὸν ἄεθλον ὃ παγκράτιον καλέουσιν,
ἀστοῖσίν κ' εἴη κυδρότερος προσορᾶν,
καί κε προεδρίην φανερὴν ἐν ἀγῶσιν ἄροιτο,
καί κεν σῖτ' εἴη δημοσίων κτεάνων
ἐκ πόλεως, καὶ δῶρον ὅ οἱ κειμήλιον εἴη·
εἴτε καὶ ἵπποισιν, ταῦτά κε *πάντα* λάχοι
οὐκ ἐὼν ἄξιος ὥσπερ ἐγώ· ῥώμης γὰρ *ἀμείνων*
ἀνδρῶν *ἠδ'* ἵππων *ἡμετέρη σοφίη.*

[64] It is noteworthy that Stobaeus ended his quotation at line 14, as if the form were complete. The other half of the poem (15-44) is elaboration.

ἀλλ' εἰκῆι μάλα τοῦτο νομίζεται, οὐδὲ δίκαιον
προκρίνειν ῥώμην τῆς ἀγαθῆς σοφίης·
οὔτε γὰρ εἰ πύκτης ἀγαθὸς λαοῖσι μετείη
οὔτ' εἰ πενταθλεῖν οὔτε παλαισμοσύνην,
οὐδὲ μὲν εἰ ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν, τόπερ ἐστὶ πρότιμον,
ῥώμης ὅσσ' ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι πέλει,
τούνεκεν ἂν δὴ μᾶλλον ἐν εὐνομίηι πόλις εἴη·
σμικρὸν δ' ἄν τι πόλει χάρμα γένοιτ' ἐπὶ τῶι,
εἴ τις ἀεθλεύων νικῶι Πίσαο παρ' ὄχθας·
οὐ γὰρ πιαίνει ταῦτα μυχοὺς πόλεως.

This passage presents may difficulties, primarily because of the allusiveness of Xenophanes' thought, which complicates the structure. In the first place, there are two catalogues. The first (1-5) is a list of events in the Olympic games, and the second (7-9) a list of rewards given by the polis to the victor. These two dovetail—somewhat awkwardly—in line 10, where εἴτε καὶ ἵπποισιν ("even if he wins with horses") adds the last entry in the catalogue of events,[65] and ταῦτά κε πάντα λάχοι summarizes the rewards. The poet is now prepared to assert his own claim, and by a bold syntactical stroke, he substitutes a concessive participle for the more straightforward ἀλλ' ἐγώ or ἐγὼ δέ. The enjambment increases the striking effect of this sudden turn at the end of a sentence already ten lines long, and the delayed ἐγώ is all the more impressive. The phrase οὐκ ἐὼν ἄξιος ὥσπερ ἐγώ establishes the superior claim of the poet with respect to the *rewards*, while the following γάρ-clause (11-12) asserts the superiority (ἀμείνων, 11) of the poet's σοφίη over the ῥώμη of men and horses [*viz.* "in the games"?]. Once again, the climactic term (ἡμετέρη σοφίη, 12) is held to the end.

---

[65] The differences in punctuation of lines 9-10 in Diehl and West show how difficult it is to fit in the phrase εἴτε καὶ ἵπποισιν (10), and once again Xenophanes' elliptical manner complicates the issue. I am in agreement with Gerber's analysis *ad loc.*: "The isolation and postponement of εἴτε ... ἵπποισιν suggest that Xenophanes attached even less importance to chariot-racing, presumably because in contrast to the other events the contestant was not solely responsible for the victory." In his typical, ironic fashion, Xenophanes has reserved until last the "crowning" event of the games, which he disparages with εἴτε καί "even if." The following γάρ-clause (11-12), "because our wisdom is better than the physical strength of men and *horses*," indicates that the poet is thinking strictly of ῥώμη as foil for his σοφίη, and consequently a victory which depended upon a mere horse's strength (and yet which won *all* those rewards) would provide the most ridiculous contrast. As a result, I prefer the traditional punctuation of lines 9-10 (as quoted in the text) to West's.

Much of the power of the priamel in Tyrtaeus 12W resulted from its straightforward simplicity: even if a man possess A or B or C... he is of no account without θοῦρις ἀλκή. Here there is no difficulty relating the list to the climax. In the case of Xenophanes, however, there is an apparent incongruity between the catalogues and the climax, raising the question as to why he gives detailed lists of the Olympic events and the rewards for victory at all. In summary form he says: "Many are the ways for a man to win in the Olympics, and many are the rewards for victory, although I am more worthy, because my wisdom is better than physical strength." This does not quite make sense, and the difficulty is caused by an ellipsis. Missing is the contrasting term: "Many are the athletes and their rewards, *but I receive no such reward*, although I am more worthy, because...." The many athletes and their many rewards are being contrasted with the single poet (with no reward).

Tyrtaeus caps a list with the most important ἀρετή; Xenophanes' procedure is entirely different. In attacking the agonal culture with its proliferation of games and awards (a modern analogy is not difficult to imagine), the poet uses the form of the priamel to heighten the *incongruity* (cf. ἀλλ' εἰκῆι μάλα τοῦτο νομίζεται, 13), nay, even the *injustice* (οὐδὲ δίκαιον, 13), of such a situation, where attention and honors are paid to the athlete, while (it is suggested) the poet receives none. The mode of this poem is, as one would expect from Xenophanes, satiric and ironic.[66] The more he expatiates on the variety of events (all aspects of ῥώμη, 11, 14, 18), the more he lists the rewards, the more forceful the incongruity will be.

This helps to explain the form of the catalogues. The first one (1-5) emphasizes ῥώμη by building toward the "heavier" contests: foot-races, pentathlon, wrestling, boxing (note ἀλγινόεσσαν, 4), and the pancratium (note δεινόν, 5). In addition to the epithets, each of the last two contests receives a full line. The list of rewards includes respect (κυδρότερος, 6) preferential treatment (προεδρίην, 7), sustenance, and money, and the emphasis is upon *public* (ἀστοῖσιν, 6; δημοσίων, 8; ἐκ πόλεως, 9) recognition and material reward, especially the latter, which is sarcastically alluded to in 22. Both lists (and cf. the third one in 15-18) end with a relative clause,

---

[66] A similar tone is, of course, adopted by Socrates at *Apol.* 36d. Note there as well the ironic tone to the list of equine events (εἴ τις ὑμῶν ἵππῳ ἢ συνωρίδι ἢ ζεύγει νενίκηκεν).

which emphasizes the last element, and sets off the entire list for the coming contrast. Clearly, what the poet is suggesting is that all kinds of athletes (and charioteers, too) gain public recognition for their physical strength, whereas his superior wisdom gets none.

In order to clarify his contention that wisdom ought to be more esteemed (προκρίνειν, 14) than physical strength, Xenophanes again lists individual athletic events (15-18), this time in the negative, in more or less reverse order, and ending with the foot-race, which he declares to be the most highly valued (πρότιμον, 17) of the *men's* contests (he is careful to exclude horse-racing here). Not only does the relative clause, with the superlative implied in πρότιμον end the catalogue, but the following clause sums up the whole list (18):

ῥώμης ὅσσ' ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι πέλει.

The gist of the argument is: "It does not matter whether a city has an athlete good at A, B, C, D, or even E; it is no better governed as a result." Once again, the elements of a priamel are employed, but obliquely, for the implication behind the list is the question: "which type of athlete most benefits the polis?" Of course, the poet does not intend such a question; he means to say: "*No* athlete (exhaustive, illustrative list) deserves the present rewards (illustrative list) as much as I do, because *no* athlete (illustrative list) improves the government of a city." Finally, in the last three lines, he dispenses with the lists altogether and employs the summary statement: εἴ τις ἀεθλεύων νικῶι (21).[67] In sum, Xenophanes has adapted all the formal elements of the priamel (lists, climaxes, summary motifs, evaluation, contrast), but he has skewed the logic in two ways. First, the lists serve to provide an element of burlesque (as if it really mattered just what kind of event an Olympic victor won). Second, he leaves two logical assumptions unstated: 1) that his σοφίη goes unrecognized and unrewarded, and 2) that his σοφίη *does* augment the coffers of the polis. The form suggests them, but it is part of his ironic manner to leave them unstated.[68]

---

[67] B. A. Van Groningen, *La Composition Littéraire Archaïque Grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 89 rightly notes that Xenophanes develops the same thought three times (1-12, 13-19, and 20-22). Each time the number of examples decreases until the third time, when there is only the summary expression εἴ τις ἀεθλεύων (21).

[68] For other ironic priamels, where a major premise (or conclusion) is merely implied, cf. Theogn. 699-718, 183-188, [Theoc.] 20.34-42, and Pet. *Sat.* 83.10.5.

5. *Sappho*

Undoubtedly the most famous priamel in Greek literature, and the one which is invariably cited as a primary example,[69] is in the opening stanza of *fr.* 16:

> ο]ἰ μὲν ἰππήων στρότον, οἰ δὲ πέσδων,
> οἰ δὲ νάων φαῖσ' ἐπ[ὶ] γᾶν μέλαι[ν]αν
> ἔ]μμεναι κάλλιστον, *ἔγω δὲ κῆν'* ὄτ-
> τω τις *ἔραται*·

The form is closely allied to (and perhaps descends from) hymnal passages such as *h. Hom.* 1.1-6, where the poet lists the rival claims concerning the god's birthplace before rejecting them in favor of his own proposal.[70] Here the point at issue is τί κάλλιστον;[71] The indication of quantity and diversity is supplied by οἰ μὲν ... οἰ δὲ ... οἰ δέ (1-2), and by the horsemen, footmen, and ships, but all these claims are linked logically, in that they are all in the military sphere, just as they are all dependent grammatically upon the word στρότον. In reality, only two things are being contrasted, war and love, but Sappho has subdivided the first category, giving the impression that many different opinions are being offered, when in fact the conflicting claims are confined to a very narrow sphere.[72] These various opinions are then rejected *en bloc* by the poet's personal assertion: ἐγὼ δὲ κῆν' ὄτ- / τω τις ἔραται (3-4). The prominent shift of subject, the adversative δέ, and the purposely withheld ἔραται (4)

---

[69] G. Wills, "The Sapphic 'Umwertung aller Werte'," *AJPh* 88 (1967) 434 n. 1 reviews the list, which could be continued with many more entries.

[70] Cf. *supra* pp. 43-45.

[71] On the relationship of a question of the form τί τὸ κάλλιστον (ἥδιστον, etc.) with a priamel (and a riddle, to which the priamel sometimes bears affinity), cf. E. Fraenkel (*Intro.*, n. 10) 407-408. The question behind the priamel attributed to Alcaeus (426 L-P) is τί ἐστιν ἡ πόλις; and the contrast is between the city's physical construction (summed up as τέχνη τεκτόνων in 426 L-P and as ὁ τῶν ἀψύχων κόσμος in another version at Aristid. *Or.* 23.68 K.) and the men capable of defending it.

[72] The items of foil in both Xenoph. 2.1-5 and Sappho *fr.* 16.1-2 give the impression of diversity, when in fact they merely enumerate species of one thing. Ultimately, the contrast in Xenophanes is between athletics and wisdom, while in Sappho it is between others' preference for the *éclat* of military display and her own (βολλοίμαν, 17) for Anactoria's graces. But the Sapphic priamel (as specified in lines 15-20) also *implies* a contrast between the public and private, the grand and small, the impersonal and personal, and literary themes of war and love (and in this sense it bears a resemblance to the *recusatio*, as the imitation of *Anacreontea* 26 makes clear). Cf. the similar priamel at *Psalm* 20.7: "Some (אֵלֶּה) boast of chariots, and some (וְאֵלֶּה) of horses; but we (וַאֲנַחְנוּ) boast of the name of the Lord our God."

signal the climax. Rather than dispute with them which στρότον is most beautiful, Sappho shifts the argument to another level by stating a principle which embraces their choices as well as her own.[73] The formal priamel is complete at this point, but Sappho has purposely used the vague terms κῆν' ὄττω τις, so that after the "proof" in lines 5-14 she can triumphantly specify her own case (τις → με νῦν, 15; κῆν' → βᾶμα / κάμάρυχμα, 17-18) in lines 15 ff.[74] This remarkable poem contains the only priamel of note in Sappho's extant poems.[75]

6. *Solon*

Fr. 9W (10D) opens with a priamel.

ἐκ νεφέλης πέλεται χιόνος μένος ἠδὲ χαλάζης,
  βροντὴ δ' ἐκ λαμπρῆς γίγνεται ἀστεροπῆς·
ἀνδρῶν δ' ἐκ μεγάλων πόλις ὄλλυται, ἐς δὲ μονάρχου
  δῆμος ἀϊδρίηι δουλοσύνην ἔπεσεν.
λίην δ' ἐξάραντ' <οὐ> ῥάιδιόν ἐστι κατασχεῖν
  ὕστερον, ἀλλ' ἤδη χρὴ <καλὰ> πάντα νοεῖν.

As we have noted before, the climax of a priamel can express analogy or contrast. Here the relationship between foil and climax is neatly ambiguous. On the one hand, the δέ in the climax ἀνδρῶν δ' ἐκ μεγάλων (3) can be seen as adversative, since the prominent ἀνδρῶν states the new category. Thus Gerber says, "Solon is stating that natural phenomena arise from natural causes, but it is a human source that brings about the destruction of a city."[76] On the other hand, the parataxis can also express analogy. Thus Campbell says, "Solon links the couplets by a mere δέ, but it is clear that he

---

[73] As Wills (above, note 69) 437 points out. It is clear, however, in what follows that Sappho intends ἔραται in the narrow sense.

[74] Bundy (1962) 5 terms lines 15 ff. a "concrete climax," which is an apt description of Sappho's procedure. Once the priamel of lines 1-4 has arrived at the new subject (ἔρως), the rest of the poem consists of an elaboration (*per exemplum*) and a specification (in the "present" of the poem) of the poem's *thesis*.

[75] There is a sense of climax in the list of *fr.* 104(a)2 L-P, but it is hardly a priamel (at least as the fragment now exists). *Fr.* 115 L-P could have been expanded into a priamel (note the summary word τίωι), but Sappho answers her question immediately:

τίωι σ', ὦ φίλε γάμβρε, κάλως ἐικάσδω;
ὄρπακι βραδίνωι σε *μάλιστ'* ἐικάσδω.

Cf. Pindar I. 7.1 ff., especially τίνι (1) and μάλιστα (2). Menander *fr.* 656 also searches for an εἰκόνα (1).

[76] D. Gerber (above, note 57) 136-137.

regards political events as bound by laws similar to the laws of nature: as the cloud brings snow and hail, and lightning is followed by thunder, the emergence of 'great men' will lead to the destruction of the city.''[77] Each argument is correct, but both are wrong in trying to limit δέ to one interpretation. The poet has chosen the destructive images of nature (snow, hail, thunder and lightning) as an *analogy* to the "destruction" (ὄλλυται, 3) wrought by "great men," for if he were merely illustrating laws of nature, he could have chosen perfectly neutral examples. On the other hand, we cannot help but appreciate the *differences* between the realm of nature and the world of men: we cannot do anything about the weather, but we can do something about politics, as the last two lines of this fragment—and Solon's own career—demonstrate. There are other priamels with similarly ambiguous climaxes, and it robs them of complexity to restrict their meaning to one single aspect.

In the middle of the long and rather diffuse elegy to the Muses (13W, 1D), there is an extensive priamel (43-64):

σπεύδει δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος· ὁ μὲν κατὰ πόντον ἀλᾶται
  ἐν νηυσὶν χρήιζων οἴκαδε κέρδος ἄγειν
ἰχθυόεντ' ἀνέμοισι φορεόμενος ἀργαλέοισιν,
  φειδωλὴν ψυχῆς οὐδεμίαν θέμενος·
ἄλλος γῆν τέμνων πολυδένδρεον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
  λατρεύει, τοῖσιν καμπύλ' ἄροτρα μέλει·
ἄλλος Ἀθηναίης τε καὶ Ἡφαίστου πολυτέχνεω
  ἔργα δαεὶς χειροῖν ξυλλέγεται βίοτον,
ἄλλος Ὀλυμπιάδων Μουσέων πάρα δῶρα διδαχθείς,
  ἱμερτῆς σοφίης μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος·
ἄλλον μάντιν ἔθηκεν ἄναξ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων,
  ἔγνω δ' ἀνδρὶ κακὸν τηλόθεν ἐρχόμενον,
ᾧ συνομαρτήσωσι θεοί· τὰ δὲ μόρσιμα πάντως
  οὔτέ τις οἰωνὸς ῥύσεται οὔθ' ἱερά·
ἄλλοι Παιῶνος πολυφαρμάκου ἔργον ἔχοντες
  ἰητροί· καὶ τοῖς οὐδὲν ἔπεστι τέλος·
πολλάκι δ' ἐξ ὀλίγης ὀδύνης μέγα γίγνεται ἄλγος,
  κοὐκ ἄν τις λύσαιτ' ἤπια φάρμακα δούς·
τὸν δὲ κακαῖς νούσοισι κυκώμενον ἀργαλέαις τε

[77] D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (New York 1967) 245. Cf. E. Voegelin (above, note 60) 195: "The historical causality is modeled on the causality of nature that was being discovered at the time by the Ionian physicists."

> ἀψάμενος χειροῖν αἶψα τίθησ' ὑγιῆ.
> *Μοῖρα δέ τοι* θνητοῖσι κακὸν φέρει ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλόν,
> δῶρα δ' ἄφυκτα θεῶν γίγνεται ἀθανάτων.

It begins with a very general observation concerning the diversity of human endeavors: σπεύδει δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος (43), with an emphasis on the *source* (ἄλλοθεν) from which men strive to obtain a livelihood. Such a general statement indicating quantity or diversity can readily be expanded with specific examples, and that is what Solon does in the following lines: ὁ μὲν (43) ... ἄλλος (47) ... ἄλλος (49) ... ἄλλος (51) ... ἄλλον (53) ... ἄλλοι (57).[78] The first two examples, marine merchant and farmer, broadly sketch the two great divisions of trade and farming, but also of land and sea.[79] Thereafter, the specific skills of the artisan, poet, seer, and doctor are listed. The first two are mentioned in one couplet each; the third receives two couplets, and the last three. This elaboration at the end of a catalogue is quite impressive, and here emphasizes the ultimate ineffectiveness of technical skill to master the environment. The climax comes at 63: "But, of course, it is Fate that brings men success and failure."

As in the case of Tyrtaeus 12W, we can juxtapose the opening and closing statements in order to see more clearly the force of the priamel:

> σπεύδει δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος...(43)
> *Μοῖρα δέ τοι θνητοῖσι* κακὸν *φέρει* ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλόν.(63)

Μοῖρα answers ἄλλοθεν, θνητοῖσι answers ἄλλος, and φέρει answers σπεύδει. From all this diversity is discovered a unity: the success of all human striving ultimately depends on Fate and what the gods give us. The remaining lines of the elegy (65-76) further develop this relationship between men and gods,[80] but it should be noted

[78] Such "occupational" priamels, which descend from passages like *Od.* 14.222 ff., are very common in authors from Pindar to Horace. Cf. Bundy (1962) 11 n. 34, and add Prop. 2.1.43-46.

[79] The broad sketching in the foil of some priamels (e.g. *h. Hom.* 3.21-24 and Pindar I. 1.47 ff.) is impressive in its own right, indicating a grasp of the totality of experience before assessing its particulars. This is especially true of the hymnal openings of Pindar's odes (e.g. O. 12, O. 14, N. 7, N. 8, I. 5, and I. 7, all of which are priamels). Although it is not in a priamel, Homer uses the same procedure in the opening of his description of Achilles' shield at *Il.* 18.483-489.

[80] The ending (65-76) is an elaboration of the pentameter in the climax: δῶρα δ' ἄφυκτα θεῶν γίγνεται ἀθανάτων.

that the poet has carefully prepared us *in the catalogue* for the climax. The merchant is prey (φορεόμενος, 45) to winds, the farmer is bound (λατρεύει, 48) to the soil and seasons, and the patron deity of each craft is prominently mentioned. The empirical list contains within it substantiation for the climactic assertion that the gods are the source of all human achievement and failure.[81]

7. Theognis

The Theognidean corpus contains several priamels, and they show considerable variety of form and purpose. The longest and best known occurs at 699-718:

> πλήθει δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀρετὴ μία γίνεται ἥδε,
> πλουτεῖν· τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐδὲν ἄρ' ἦν ὄφελος,
> οὐδ' εἰ σωφροσύνην μὲν ἔχοις Ῥαδαμάνθυος αὐτοῦ,
> πλείονα δ' εἰδείης Σισύφου Αἰολίδεω,
> ὅς τε καὶ ἐξ Ἀΐδεω πολυιδρίῃσιν ἀνῆλθεν
> πείσας Περσεφόνην αἱμυλίοισι λόγοις,
> ἥ τε βροτοῖς παρέχει λήθην βλάπτουσα νόοιο—
> ἄλλος δ' οὔ πώ τις τοῦτό γ' ἐπεφράσατο,
> ὅντινα δὴ θανάτοιο μέλαν νέφος ἀμφικαλύψῃ,
> ἔλθῃ δ' ἐς σκιερὸν χῶρον ἀποφθιμένων,
> κυανέας τε πύλας παραμείψεται, αἵ τε θανόντων
> ψυχὰς εἴργουσιν καίπερ ἀναινομένας·
> ἀλλ' ἄρα κἀκεῖθεν πάλιν ἤλυθε Σίσυφος ἥρως
> ἐς φάος ἠελίου σφῇσι πολυφροσύναις—
> οὐδ' εἰ ψεύδεα μὲν ποιοῖς ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
> γλῶσσαν ἔχων ἀγαθὴν Νέστορος ἀντιθέου,
> ὠκύτερος δ' εἴησθα πόδας ταχεῶν Ἁρπυιῶν
> καὶ παίδων Βορέω, τῶν ἄφαρ εἰσὶ πόδες.
> *ἀλλὰ χρὴ πάντας γνώμην ταύτην* καταθέσθαι,
> ὡς πλοῦτος *πλείστην* πᾶσιν ἔχει δύναμιν.

The form is obviously a variation of *Il.* 9.378-391, and more particularly of Tyrtaeus 12W (as is commonly pointed out), but the intention is ironic, for the assertion that wealth is the prime virtue is obviously not held by the poet. In Xenophanes 2W we noted that the priamel was used to create a satiric contrast between the foil and climax; here the irony is taken a step further in that the entire priamel is spoken by an *advocatus diaboli*.

---

[81] Cf. the analysis of A. W. Allen, "Solon's Prayer to the Muses," TAPA 80 (1949) 57-61.

Because he means to give a jolt, the poet opens with the type of statement often found at the climax of a priamel: "For most men the only virtue is wealth, and the others are useless...." This startling assertion is followed by a list of ἀρεταί which specify τῶν ἄλλων (700), ostensibly to prove the superiority of wealth.[82] The list includes temperance, wisdom, eloquence, and fleetness of foot,[83] and the examples are introduced by οὐδ' εἰ, as they were in Tyrtaeus 12W and Xenophanes 2W. One notable feature of the catalogue is the elaboration of the second item, wisdom, by the extensive narrative of Sisyphus' sagacity (cf. πολυιδρίῃσιν, 703; πολυφροσύναις, 712). I know of no other example where a middle term in a list receives such emphasis.

The final couplet is not otiose, but is essential for completing the priamel. It contains a large number of elements usually occuring in a climax. The ἀλλά (717) is one signal,[84] as is the change of subject and mood in χρή (717). The prominent πάντας is very important. It marks a shift from the πλήθει (699) which introduced the priamel; what was originally the opinion of the majority has now become binding upon *all* (cf. πᾶσιν, 718). It is as if the poet, as a result of his survey, has become confident (ironically, of course) in asserting the *universal* power of πλοῦτος. Put differently, Theognis is saying that if indeed the above reasoning is correct, then the last couplet expresses the logical conclusion. Further signals include the word γνώμην (717) which is almost *sermo technicus* for the general conclusion which often completes a priamel and the deictic ταύτην (717), which reinforces the sense of "arrival" at a *punctum*. And in the γνώμη itself, the prominent πλοῦτος (718) announces the subject of concern, the πλείστην (718) provides the evaluative element, and the πᾶσιν (718) adds alliterative assistance. This procedure of stating a principle, then supporting it with examples which then culminate in

---

[82] Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) 26 rightly sees the irony in this passage, but his contention that the examples in the foil actually belie the poet's (ironic) assertion is unconvincing.

[83] ταχυτῆς ποδῶν here and elsewhere (e.g. Tyrt. 12.2, 4W, Xenoph. 2.1, 17W, Pindar I. 5.10, [Theoc.] 8.54) epitomizes athletic ability and often appears in prominent positions in catalogues.

[84] On ἀλλά introducing a climax, cf. *Intro.* n. 39. Here the ἀλλά is not strictly adversative, but reinforces the imperatival force of χρή (cf. Smyth 2784c). Imperatives are common in the climaxes of priamels (cf. *Intro.* n. 45), and here χρή has almost a *logical* force after the "inductive" examples: "everyone must conclude."

a climactic restatement of the point is a regular feature in Ovid.[85]

A brief priamel occurs in 183-188, where the poet contrasts the sane breeding of sheep, asses, and horses (where εὐγένεια is the standard for selection of mates), with that of human marriage (where πλοῦτος has become the determining factor).

κριοὺς μὲν καὶ ὄνους διζήμεθα Κύρνε καὶ ἵππους
εὐγενέας, καί τις βούλεται ἐξ ἀγαθῶν
βήσεσθαι· *γῆμαι δὲ κακὴν* κακοῦ οὐ μελεδαίνει
ἐσθλὸς ἀνήρ, ἤν οἱ χρήματα πολλὰ διδῶι,
οὐδὲ γυνὴ κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναίνεται εἶναι ἄκοιτις
πλουσίου, ἀλλ' ἀφνεὸν βούλεται ἀντ' ἀγαθοῦ....

The effect of the priamel is one of incongruity: the animals are listed in order to emphasize the universality of good breeding outside the sphere of human marriage, which has now become unnatural. The list leads to one conclusion, which is reversed in the climax. One notable feature of this passage is the relationship of the priamel to the form of the elegiac couplet. There is a tendency in elegy to introduce the capping term at the beginning of a hexameter, or at the end of a verse. Here it occurs within the hexameter, and its effect is quite striking. In line 184 εὐγενέας is enjambed for emphasis, and in the following line the verb βήσεσθαι is also enjambed, but it is followed immediately by γῆμαι δέ to make the contrast (and the incongruity) all the more surprising. In comparison, the close imitation (in hexameters) of Ps. Phocylides (201-203) produces quite different effects:

ἵππους εὐγενέας διζήμεθα γειαρότας τε
ταύρους ὑψιτένοντας, ἀτὰρ σκυλάκων πανάριστον·
γῆμαι δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴν ἐριδαίνομεν ἀφρονέοντες.

Here there is no question of εὐγένεια, which only applies to ἵππους. The point of this priamel is that we look for quality in animals, but we do not strive to acquire a good wife, and the incongruity of this is stressed in the last word: ἀφρονέοντες. The sophistication and subtle use of form in the priamel of Theognis are lacking in this much more straightforward example.

There are two brief priamels which use arguments from analogy to make their points. These represent two very different types that occur quite frequently in later poetry. The first is 1103-1104:

---

[85] Cf. among many examples R.A. 441-452, *Tr.* 2.266-276, and *Am.* 2.17.14-24.

ὕβρις καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα
  καὶ Σμύρνην· *πάντως Κύρνε καὶ ὔμμ' ἀπολεῖ.*

The logical force of the analogy is stressed by the emphatic πάντως ("assuredly")[86] and the climax is also signalled by the shift of person, the direct address, and the shift of tense from past (ἀπώλεσε) to future (ἀπολεῖ). This form of inductive priamel (*tu quoque* in Latin) generally has a hortatory function, either apotreptic (as here) or protreptic.

At 537-538 the poet employs an analogy from plants to stress the assertion that slavery is rooted in nature (cf. φύεται, 537):

οὔτε γὰρ ἐκ σκίλλης ῥόδα φύεται οὐδ' ὑάκινθος,
  οὔτέ ποτ' ἐκ δούλης τέκνον ἐλευθέριον.

This is a skeletal form of the very popular "*adynaton*."[87] In the climax, the word ποτέ ("never") adumbrates what will later become the more explicit θᾶττον (*citius*, etc.) A, B ... ἤ (*quam*) X.

At the end of his prayer of appreciation to Apollo for having saved Megara from the Persians (if indeed the final lines are to be appended to the prayer),[88] the poet uses a priamel to stress the special love which he has of his homeland (783-788):

ἦλθον μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ εἰς Σικελήν ποτε γαῖαν,
  ἦλθον δ' Εὐβοίης ἀμπελόεν πεδίον,
Σπάρτην τ' Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφου ἀγλαὸν ἄστυ,
  καί μ' ἐφίλευν προφρόνως πάντες ἐπερχόμενον·
ἀλλ' οὔτίς μοι τέρψις ἐπὶ φρένας ἦλθεν ἐκείνων·
  οὕτως οὐδὲν ἄρ' ἦν φίλτερον ἄλλο *πάτρης.*

The priamel adopts the form of a journey (ἦλθον, 783, 784) to impressive "other" places as foil for one's homeland. Note the summary motif in πάντες (786), the adversative ἀλλά (787), the evaluative motif in οὐδὲν...φίλτερον (788), and the withheld subject of most importance, πάτρης (788).[89]

---

[86] Note the emphatic position of πάντως (1104) before the caesura. Here is another instance of the striking variety of effects in the elegiacs of the Theognidean corpus.

[87] Cf. *Intro.*, pp. 28-29.

[88] The γάρ (783) strongly suggests that this is indeed part of the prayer.

[89] This priamel is complicated. The straightforward statement would be: "I have visited various pleasant places, but none is dearer than my homeland." Theognis has varied the form by using ἀλλά (787) strictly to reject the "others" (ἐκείνων, 787), and then stating the positive climax in a gnome in the pentameter (788). This is an "inductive" priamel in which the poet's own experience is brought to bear on the conclusion. Note the *logical* force of οὕτως (= *ergo*), and the

One remarkable feature of the Theognidean corpus, which is apparent in this brief survey of the priamel, is the *variety* of form. Not a single one of these priamels is stereotypical; each presents peculiar and striking features.[90]

8. *Semonides and Mimnermus*

Semonides *fr.* 1W employs an inductive priamel with a symbouleutic intention (note the introductory ὦ παῖ, 1). In the opening lines occur the summary words πάντων (2), ὅκῃ θέλει (2), ἕκαστον (5), and πάντας (6). Then follows the list illustrating the vicissitudes of men's lives (7-19), summed up in the conclusion: οὕτω κακῶν ἄπ' οὐδέν (20). The succeeding ἀλλά (20) is not the adversative so frequently found in climaxes, but completes the summary (note μυρίαι, 20) in positive form. Having thus inductively proved the instability of human fortune, Semonides concludes with the advice which is the point of the whole priamel: εἰ δ' ἐμοὶ πιθοίατο... (22-24).[91]

Mimnermus *fr.* 2W contains a similar form.[92] Here the summary πολλὰ ... κακά (11) is expanded by ἄλλοτε (11), ἄλλος (13), and ἄλλος (15), and subsequently summarized again in lines 15-16:

οὐδέ τίς ἐστιν
ἀνθρώπων ὧι Ζεὺς μὴ κακὰ πολλὰ διδοῖ.

Unfortunately, the fragment ends here. Presumably there would follow an injunction to love while one is still able, along the lines of the protreptic priamel of Semonides above.

The catalogues of wives in Semonides 7W and (in abbreviated form) Ps. Phocylides both end with the best type of wife, the "bee," but with a very different emphasis. In the didactic fragment of Ps.

---

emotional component implicit in ἄρ' ἦν (788) "after all," both the results of empirical experience.

[90] I have not treated Theognis 255-256, the "Delian inscription," nor any other *skolia* on the grounds that the sense of climax is lacking in all of them; they are really mere lists, whose elements can be rearranged *ad libitum*. Schmid's arguments (*Intro.* n. 13) 105 ff. (and esp. 109) for an "ironic" intention in Theogn. 255-256 are (to me) unconvincing.

[91] On εἰ δέ introducing a climax, cf. *Intro.*, n. 43.

[92] Both of these fragments are quoted at Stob. 4.34, περὶ τοῦ βίου, ὅτι βραχὺς καὶ φροντίδων ἀνάμεστος. This accounts for the similarity of content, as well as the fact that only the foil of Mimnermus *fr.* 2W is given, for the climax would presumably be inappropriate to quote here. One strange result of this is that generations of students have come to know Mimnermus as a rather gloomy soul. Also, because the climax of Semonides' fragment (written in iambic trimeter) happened to fall mid-line (εἰ δ' ἐμοί, 22) Stobaeus went on to quote the next two lines.

Phocylides,[93] the point of the list is to single out the bee-wife as the only good one in contrast to the other undesirables. It is she alone whom he counsels his φίλ' ἑταῖρε (8) to marry. In the long fragment of Semonides, whose main purpose is censure of women in general, the bee-wife also ends the catalogue and is singled out (cf. οἴῃ, 84) as the best (cf. ἀρίστας καὶ πολυφραδεστάτας, 93). But the poet returns immediately to τὰ...ἄλλα φῦλα (94) and continues his censure. She is duly praised, but she can hardly be said to have any other function than simply ending the catalogue, for she is not the ultimate subject of interest, and the other "types" are certainly not foil for her. This is an unusual case: the form of the priamel leads us to expect a climax (as in Ps. Phocylides), but the poet passes on by, as if the bee-wife had no particular importance.

9. *Critias*

Athenaeus 1.27D ff. preserves several lists of special products (ἰδιώματα) from various cities. Although he cites only relevant bits and pieces from numerous authors, several fragments are clearly priamels. One is Pindar *fr.* 106, which, Athenaeus assures us (1.28A), was in a Pythian Ode to Hieron.

'Απὸ Ταϋγέτοιο μὲν Λάκαιναν
ἐπὶ θηρσὶ κύνα τρέχειν
πυκινώτατον ἑρπετόν·
Σκύριαι δ' ἐς ἄμελξιν γλάγεος αἶγες *ἐξοχώταται*·
ὅπλα δ' ἀπ' Ἄργεος, ἅρμα Θη-
βαῖον, *ἀλλ'* ἀπὸ *τᾶς ἀγλαοκάρπου*
Σικελίας ὄχημα δαιδάλεον *ματεύειν*.

The superlatives in the foil terms (πυκινώτατον, 3; ἐξοχώταται, 4) obviate the need for a superlative in the climax, since a context corresponding to the question τί ἄριστον has already been established. The brief examples of arms from Argos and Theban chariot serve to set off the richly described climactic term. Note also the adversative ἀλλά (5) and the climactic imperative (ματεύειν, 6).[94]

Immediately following, Athenaeus cites Critias 2W, which picks up, as it were, where Pindar left off (cf. the Sicilian ὄχος, 3), and continues the list to its culmination in Attic pottery (while getting in

---

[93] *Fr.* 3 (Edmonds) = Stob. 73.60.

[94] Here the ἀλλά is both adversative and reinforcement for the imperative. Note also the deictic τᾶς (5) and the epithet ἀγλαοκάρπου (5), the only one which qualifies a city.

an allusion to the Athenian victory at Marathon). Such climactic lists obviously became popular, and Athenaeus cites parts of two others: one from Archestratus (1.29BD = *fr.* 59 Ribbeck), which praises Lesbian wine above all others; and one from the comic playwright Hermippus (1.29EF = Kock 1.249), who has Dionysus praise nectar above all other drinks.

10. *Pindar*

The Greek poet who is the indisputed master of the priamel is Pindar. It was in connection with his poetry that Dornseiff began his study of the priamel, and that Bundy recognized in the priamel "perhaps the most important structural principle known to choral poetry, in particular to those forms devoted to praise."[95] Fortunately, the use of the priamel in Pindar has been so thoroughly discussed in Bundy's monographs that there is no need to attempt here an exhaustive study—indeed, the term priamel is as common in Pindaric studies as simile is in Homeric. But in trying to clarify the complex use of "foil" in the odes, Bundy used the term priamel in a much more inclusive sense than it is used in this study.[96] Here we shall discuss some of the major types.

As was noted,[97] one of Bundy's very useful distinctions was what he called a "summary priamel," where a potential list of concrete examples is summarized by words denoting quantity or variety within a class. These summary priamels abound in Pindar, and they invariably have the function of *introducing* a new topic.[98] Concurrently, there are often subsidiary elements of *transition* and *amplification*. The summary statement provides the context within which the *hic et nunc* emerges as the concrete manifestation of the universal. For example, at the end of N. 4, Pindar declines to sing of the praises of Timasarchus' father (he leaves it up to the grandfather to do).[99] The ensuing priamel is transitional, in that it explains the principle of the preceding refusal (i.e., "I leave it up to your grandfather, because he knew him"), but it is also introduc-

---

[95] Bundy (1962) 5.

[96] Cf. *Intro.*, p. 10.

[97] Cf. *Intro.*, pp. 10-13.

[98] They can also occur at the end of an ode (e.g. O. 3.42-45) to make a particularly salient point. Cf. the brief discussion of priamels by E. Thummer, *Pindar, Die Isthmischen Gedichte II* (Heidelberg 1968) 27-29.

[99] For the interpretation of this passage, which maintains the MSS. reading of ἀείσεται, cf. Bundy (1972) 66 n. 73.

tory, in that it singles out a contemporary of the poet, whom, on the same principle, he could indeed praise, the trainer Melesias (91-93):[100]

> ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλιχες ἄλλοι· *τὰ δ' αὐτὸς* ἀντιτύχῃ,
> ἔλπεταί τις ἕκαστος *ἐξοχώτατα* φάσθαι.
> *οἷον* αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι...

Another example occurs at the end of O.1, where the poet singles out Hieron's greatest achievement (113-114):

> † ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· *τὸ δ' ἔ-*
> *σχατον κορυφοῦται*
> *βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι* πάπταινε πόρσιον.

This priamel merely sketches the diversity of human achievement, and the reader is at liberty to specify ways in which men excel (μεγάλοι, 113)—certainly success in the games is foremost in our thoughts in a victory ode. But all these are put in the shade, for the ultimate crown belongs to kings. Here are all the elements associated with the priamel: 1) the universal category "greatness" (μεγάλοι, 113); 2) diversity (ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι, 113); 3) the capping particle (δέ, 113); 4) indication of relative merit (ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται, 113); and 5) the subject of ultimate interest (βασιλεῦσι, 114), withheld for climactic effect. This is then reinforced by the confident μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον (114), which puts any attempt at disagreement beside the question by sealing the logic of the priamel.[101]

The priamel which ends 0.3 is so similar that it is instructive to compare them. In this case it is Theron who has reached the apex of human achievement (42-45):

> εἰ δ' *ἀριστεύει* μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ
> χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος,
> *νῦν δὲ* πρὸς *ἐσχατιὰν*
> *Θήρων* ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται
> οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος
> σταλᾶν. τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον
> κἀσόφοις.

---

[100] Note the adversative δέ (91), the superlative ἐξοχώτατα (92), and the concrete specification of τά (91) in the name of Melesias. For the use of a form of τις (or equivalent) in the climax of a priamel, which is then specified in the ensuing passage, cf. Sappho *fr.* 16 and the discussion *supra*, p. 64. For the force of οἷον (93), cf. above, note 6.

[101] μηκέτι (114) also adds a temporal element (equivalent to the positive νῦν at O. 3.43 and elsewhere). Cf. above, note 12.

Here the general context is supplied by the word ἀριστεύει (42), for we are searching, as it were, for the *best* of things (cf. O. 1.1 ff.). Instead of summarily saying that various things are best in various ways, two illustrations are given: on the one hand (μέν, 42) water is best, but then (δέ, 42), when it comes to possessions (this could be expanded) gold is the most venerable. The protasis has provided examples of excellence in the natural and material realms;[102] the apodosis gives a parallel and third domain of excellence: human achievement (ἀρεταῖσιν, 43). The particles νῦν δέ (43) signal the climax, and the subject of ultimate interest, held for suspense after the evaluative ἐσχατιάν (43) and linked with ἀρεταῖσιν (43), is the proper name Theron, which concretizes excellence in the human realm, of which the Pillars of Heracles are the heroic exemplar for the *hic* (οἴκοθεν, 44) and *nunc* (νῦν, 43). Then, as in O. 1.114, the poet seals the superlative nature of the achievement by stating that there is no further to go. The doublet "wise and foolish" is another way of saying πᾶσιν.[103] This schematic table will point out the similarities:

O. 1.113-114	*O. 3.42-45*
1) μεγάλοι	1) ἀριστεύει
2) ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι	2) ὕδωρ, χρυσός
3) τὸ δέ	3) νῦν δέ
4) ἔσχατον	4) ἐσχατιάν
5) βασιλεῦσι	5) ἀρεταῖσιν/Θήρων
πόρσιον	τὸ πόρσω

The priamel from O.1 selects a category (βασιλεῦσι) which is best within the realm of human endeavor (ἄλλοι), later concretized with σε (115); the one from O.3 presents concrete examples of excellence within various realms, so that the capping term contains both the category (ἀρεταῖσιν) and the concrete manifestation of excellence within it (Θήρων).

Another variation of this same form and material occurs in the famous opening of the First *Olympian* (1-7):

> Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
> ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου·
> *εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαρύεν*
> *ἔλδεαι, φίλον ἦτορ,*

[102] Cf. below, note 104.

[103] It is, of course, a typical "polare Ausdruck," but σοφοῖς at O. 3.43 neatly echoes σοφίᾳ at O. 1.116.

μηκέτ' ἀελίου σκόπει
ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἁμέρᾳ φαεν-
νὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι' αἰθέρος,
μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·

This priamel is more complex than the previous two, principally because Pindar has added two similes (fire in the night, the sun in the day) to emphasize the obvious superiority of two of the terms. Otherwise, the form is quite regular, even though there is some misunderstanding about certain aspects.[104] The first word ἄριστον (cf. ἀριστεύει at O. 3.42) provides the universal context: the priamel is concerned with things which are "best." The first example of superiority in one field (nature) is water (cf. ὑδάτων at O. 11.2, also a foil term in an introductory priamel), and the second example is gold, whose superiority (ἔξοχα, 2) in the realm of wealth is as obvious as fire gleaming in the night. The climax is signalled by the change of syntax in εἰ δ' (3) (cf. εἰ δέ at O. 11.4, which also signals the climax after two foil terms, the second of which was elaborated upon), by the prominent ἄεθλα (3), which provides the new category "athletics,"[105] and by the change of person (ἔλδεαι, 4) and the vocative address (φίλον ἦτορ, 4), as well as his intention to celebrate (γαρύεν, 3). The protasis has supplied the specific category (cf. O. 1.113-114), and the apodosis supplies the specific example. But in order to withhold the name itself until the last for climactic effect, Pindar interposes a logically "false" apodosis (clearly equivalent to μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον at O. 1.114, but here preceding the climax), which is virtually a simile without ἅτε (cf. 2). Then at last comes the ringing line (7):

μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·

The Olympic contest is as supreme (μηδ' ... φέρτερον = φέρτατον) in its sphere as water, gold, and the sun are in theirs. Now that the poet has elaborately singled out the Olympic games as his theme, he can continue in the following lines to specify the victor himself: Hieron.

---

[104] Gerber (above, note 57) 374 succinctly states the logic of the priamel: "Pindar mentions three elements (water, gold, and the sun) which in their own environment surpass all else and which lead the poet to the games which surpass all other games." Cf. also Bundy (1962) 6 n. 20 and my "Pindar's 'Best is water': Best of What?" GRBS 22 (1981) 119-124.

[105] Whether the neuter ἄεθλα (3) means "contest" or "prizes" of the contest does not affect the fact that it designates a new category, within which Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα will be singled out.

Another summary priamel of note occurs near the beginning of O. 7, after the magnificent simile in which Pindar compares the "toast" of his song for Olympic and Pythian victors with the toast of a rich man at his daughter's wedding. Since he has already established his intention to sing of major athletic victories, it remains for him to single out the individual (among many who have been celebrated for winning in the great games), and he does this with a priamel (11-13):

> ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύ-
> ει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος ἁδυμελεῖ
> θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν.
> καί νυν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων σὺν
> Διαγόρᾳ κατέβαν...

ἄλλοτε (11) probably has a temporal sense, since it is supported by θαμά (12) and contrasted with καί νυν (13) (cf. P. 11.42-44: ἄλλοτ' ... νυν). Out of this variety (and quantity, θαμά, 12) of celebration emerges the present occasion in honor of Diagoras (and Rhodes).

Near the beginning of O. 8, after his prayer to Olympia to receive the present celebration, he uses a priamel to introduce the victor (12-18):

> ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἔβαν
> ἀγαθῶν, πολλαὶ δ' ὁδοί
> σὺν θεοῖς εὐπραγίας.
> Τιμόσθενες, ὔμμε δ' ἐκλάρωσεν πότμος
> Ζηνὶ γενεθλίῳ· ὃς σὲ μὲν Νεμέᾳ πρόφατον,
> 'Αλκιμέδοντα δὲ πὰρ Κρόνου λόφῳ
> θῆκεν 'Ολυμπιονίκαν.

This example is a bit more complicated than the one from O. 7 because two summary priamels are combined. First of all there is the *variety* of blessings (ἄλλα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἔβαν / ἀγαθῶν, 12-13), and then there are the *many* ways in which the gods grant success (πολλαὶ δ' ὁδοί / σὺν θεοῖς εὐπραγίας, 13-14). The climax specifies both of them. The prominent name Timosthenes (15) signals the cap, and the following ὔμμε δ' (15) creates suspense with the unexpected plural. σὺν θεοῖς is specified by Ζηνὶ γενεθλίῳ (16), for the brothers have been victorious at Nemea and Olympia, both sacred to Zeus. ἄλλα ... ἀγαθῶν and εὐπραγίας are specified in the victories, and ἄλλον is specified in Τιμόσθενες (15), ὔμμε (15), and 'Αλκιμέδοντα (17), the latter withheld for climactic effect along with the ringing

'Ολυμπιονίκαν (18). This priamel, like the one at O. 7.11-13, briefly arrests our attention by sketching in the more universal perspective, so that the here and now can be savored in its own uniqueness as well as part of a greater tradition.[106]

There are two priamels in which Pindar delays the capping term by interposing another foil term (with a μέν-clause) in the climax. Near the beginning of P. 2, after the introductory praise of Hieron's horsemanship in lines 1-12, Pindar uses a summary priamel to introduce the gratitude of the Epizephyrian Locrians for Hieron's timely assistance (13-20):

> *ἄλλοις* δέ τις ἐτέλεσσεν *ἄλλος* ἀνήρ
> εὐαχέα βασιλεῦσιν ὕμνον ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς.
> κελαδέοντι *μὲν* ἀμφὶ Κινύραν πολλάκις
> φᾶμαι Κυπρίων, τὸν ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα προ-
>   φρόνως ἐφίλησ' 'Απόλλων,
> ἱερέα κτίλον 'Αφροδίτας· ἄγει δὲ χάρις
>   φίλων ποί τινος ἀντὶ ἔργων ὀπιζομένα·
> *σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ*, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων
> Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει,
>   πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων
> διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές·

This is another example of a transitional priamel which introduces a new theme.[107] The summary statement to the effect that various men have dedicated songs as a recompense for various kings' deeds (13-14) would have been itself sufficient to introduce the climax, but instead, Pindar provides the concrete example of Cinyras. The μέν (15) indicates that this example is really foil for the true climax, and suspense is built up as Pindar elaborates the example. He summarizes with a *gnome* in line 17 to reiterate the general principle of due gratitude, before the climactic term introduced by σὲ δ' (18) and the vocative ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ (18). It is obvious that the poet is not intrinsically interested in Cinyras, except insofar as he provides a specific "heroic" standard against which Hieron's stature can be measured.

At the end of N. 8, after a long digression on Ajax and numerous preliminary statements (including a priamel in 37-39), Pindar uses

---

[106] Other summary priamels not treated in detail in this study include O. 9.104-108, O. 13.93-97, P. 10.59-64, N. 1.25-30, I. 4.5 ff. (the climax does not come until 19 ff.), and I. 5.52-54.

[107] Note that this priamel occurs in the same position in its ode as O. 7.11-13, O. 8.12-18, and I. 4.5 ff., and has the same function.

a summary priamel to introduce the proper role of song in honoring the victor's father, Megas (42-44):

> χρεῖαι δὲ παντοῖαι φίλων ἀν-
> δρῶν· τὰ μὲν ἀμφὶ πόνοις
> ὑπερώτατα, μαστεύει δὲ καὶ τέρψις ἐν ὄμμασι θέσθαι
> πιστόν. ὦ Μέγα...

The χρεῖαι ... φίλων (42) are related to the ἀνέμων...χρῆσις in the priamel at O. 11.1 ff., where the needs of nature are capped by the need for song in the realm of μεγάλαις ἀρεταῖς (O. 11.6). Here, they are specifically the various needs which are fulfilled by *friends*, and, likewise, the capping term is the need for song, but a μέν-clause intervenes, for song is not—at least absolutely—the most important need one has. Of the various (παντοῖαι, 42) needs one has for friends, most important (ὑπερώτατα, 43) initially (μέν, 42)[108] is that in time of toil (ἀμφὶ πόνοις, 42; cf. σὺν πόνῳ at O. 11.4). *But* (δέ, 43), enjoyment (τέρψις, 43 is, like εὐφροσύνα, a metaphor for the celebration of achievement and presupposes a statement such as εἰ δὲ σὺν πόνῳ τις εὖ πράσσοι at O. 11.4) *too* (καί, 43) has a place in confirming (πιστόν, 44; cf. πιστόν at O. 11.6) achievement. In the following address to the dead Megas, Pindar admits that he cannot bring about Megas' *physical* well-being, but he can ease the pain (cf. κάματον, 50) with healing song (cf. ἐπαοιδαῖς, 49). Just as Cinyras in the above example from P. 2 is foil for Hieron, so here physical assistance is foil for the consolatory (cf. νώδυνον, 50) nature of poetry.

Earlier in the same poem (N. 8), after the digression on Ajax, Pindar uses a priamel to affirm his role as a poet (37-39):

---

[108] Cf. O. 11.5: ὑστέρων (also Bacch. 10.53: ὕστε]ρον), and P. 1.99: πρῶτον. In all of these passages the point is that *physical* requirements (bodily needs, toil, action) must be met with first, before song can crown the achievement. If one compares O. 11.1-6, N. 4.1-6, I. 1.47-51, and N. 3.6-8 (note the need for water implied in διψῇ, 6) with these passages, it becomes apparent that Pindar consistently recognizes the priority (both temporally and logically) of basic natural needs and uses them as background (as the *conditio humana*) for the role of song in fulfilling the second need for commemoration and consolation. In N. 4.1 πόνων κεκριμένων means "after laborious results" (Lattimore neatly captures the ambiguity of the genitive absolute with "The best healer for struggles of pain, after the issue is clear") and establishes the correct relationship of deed and song. This theme (and add N. 7.14-16) forms the basis for the great consolatory ode P. 3.

χρυσὸν εὔχον-
ται, πεδίον δ' *ἕτεροι*
ἀπέραντον, *ἐγὼ δ'* ἀστοῖς ἁδὼν καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι,
αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς.

Some pray for gold, others (ἕτεροι, 37) for boundless land, but I (ἐγὼ δέ, 38) .... The form is simple, but effective, and has many variations in Greek and Latin poetry.[109] The prominent ἀστοῖς ἁδών (38) suggests that the desires of those who pray for gold and land (material goods) are perhaps selfish and private, whereas the poet's concern is the welfare of his fellow-citizens through truthful application of his art.

Pindar also uses priamels to place his particular theme of praise at the end of a series of other examples, so as to enhance its stature. Two examples, which employ geographical motifs and culminate in the place (and persons) of interest, are the praise of the Battle of Himera (and the Deinomenids) at P. 1.75-80:

ἀρέομαι
πὰρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθαναίων χάριν
μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτᾳ δ' <ἀπὸ> τᾶν πρὸ Κιθαιρῶ-
νος μαχᾶν,
ταῖσι Μήδειοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι,
παρ<ὰ> δὲ τὰν εὔυδρον ἀκτὰν
Ἱμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσαις,
τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετᾷ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

and praise of the Aeacids of Aegina at I. 5.30-35:

ἐν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν θυσίαισι φαενναῖς
Οἰνεΐδαι κρατεροί,
ἐν δὲ Θήβαις ἱπποσόας Ἰόλαος
γέρας ἔχει, Περσεὺς δ' ἐν Ἄργει, Κάστορος δ' αἰχ-
μὰ Πολυδεύκεός τ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ῥεέθροις.
ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί
Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε·

109 Cf. Archil. 19W, Anacr. 8D (= 361 PMG), [Theoc.] 8.53-56, Tibullus 1.1-6, Horace C. 1.31.5-20. A prose example at Plato, *Lysis* 211d-e is noted by D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 56 *à propos* of Sappho *fr.* 16.1-4: τυγχάνω γὰρ ἐκ παιδὸς ἐπιθυμῶν κτήματός του, ὥσπερ ἄλλος ἄλλου. ὁ μὲν γάρ τις ἵππους ἐπιθυμεῖ κτᾶσθαι, ὁ δὲ κύνας, ὁ δὲ χρυσίον, ὁ δὲ τιμάς· *ἐγὼ δὲ* πρὸς μὲν *ταῦτα* πρᾴως ἔχω, πρὸς δὲ *τὴν τῶν φίλων κτῆσιν πάνυ ἐρωτικῶς*, καὶ *βουλοίμην ἂν* μοι φίλον ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ... (there follows a recapitulation reminiscent of Sappho *fr.* 16.17-20). Note here the summary motif, the list, the rejection of ταῦτα, and the speaker's own choice (ἐγὼ δέ). This passage is a model one, which combines many aspects of the tradition. It also introduces the main topic of discussion in its dialogue.

"Geographical" priamels, such as this last example, are frequently found in hymns (e.g., *h. Hom.* 1.1-9, 3.30-49) where the *sedes* of the god is in question, and they continue to be used in the epideictic *topos* of praise of cities, as in Horace's C. 1.7: *laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen.* In all of them there is a rhetorical sense of *praeteritio.*[110] Theogn. 783-788 and *A.P.* 16.1.1-2 also belong in this group.

Perhaps the most striking use of priamels in Pindar is in the great hymnal prooimia of O. 12, O. 14, N. 7, N. 8, I. 5, I. 7,[111] wherein the poet invokes a goddess (or divine principle), whose δυνάμεις provide the quantity and variety as broad background for the particular achievement of the *hic et nunc.* Many summary words and expressions occur in them,[112] as well as lists.[113] In each case, in a variety of ways, the priamel moves attention from general categories which include various types of excellence (O. 1), possible songs of gods, heroes, and men (O. 2; cf. *fr.* 29), the ups and downs of fortune (O. 12), the pleasures of life (O. 14), the attributes of birth (N. 7), the force of youthful love (N. 8), the splendor of light (I. 5), and the glories of Thebes (I. 7; cf. N. 10 for the glories of Argos), to the concrete example, which "takes its place" in the general context, as a witness to the still potent δύναμις of divine principles. In these magnificent hymns the universal and the particular complement one another in a very compelling fashion, and this fusion accounts to a great extent for the theoretical power and timeless appeal of Pindar's odes.

11. *Bacchylides*

Bacchylides' choral lyrics display a variety of priamels, from summary types to lists, but they are not so powerful or persuasive as Pindar's, chiefly because there is a certain vagueness or lack of precision in Bacchylides' style.[114] An analysis of *Dithyramb* 19 to the

---

[110] Cf. the brief, but excellent, note of Nisbet and Hubbard (*Intro.* n. 19) 92 on this tradition and their apt citation of Greg. Nyss. *epis.* 20.2 ff.

[111] Priamels also open O. 1, O. 2, O. 11, N. 6, N. 10, and Θρ. 3 (= *fr.* 128c). Cf. Bundy (1962) 36-37.

[112] O. 12 (πολλ', 6; πολλά, 10), O. 14 (πάντα, 6; πάντων, 9), N. 7 (οὐχ ἅπαντες, 5; ἕτερον ἕτερα, 6), N. 8 (ἕτερον δ' ἑτέραις, 3), N. 10 (μυρίαις, 3; πολλά, 5), and I. 5 (ἄλλων, 3).

[113] N. 10.5-18, I. 7.3-15, and *fr.* 128c.

[114] There is a quality in Bacchylides' style which I reluctantly call "impressionistic." Pindar strives constantly for a kind of intellectual precision that sometimes lapses into obscurity; Bacchylides prefers to be suggestive, and the

Athenians, which is built on priamels, will make this clearer. The poem opens with a summary priamel, which states that a gifted singer has a myriad of songs to sing (1-14)

Πάρεστι *μυρία* κέλευθος
 ἀμβροσίων μελέων,
ὃς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λά-
 χησι δῶρα Μουσᾶν,
ἰοβλέφαροί τε κ<όρ>αι
 φερεστέφανοι Χάριτες
 βάλωσιν ἀμφὶ τιμάν
ὕμνοισιν· *ὕφαινέ νυν* ἐν
 ταῖς πολυηράτοις τι καινὸν
 ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις,
εὐαίνετε Κηΐα μέριμνα.
 πρέπει σε *φερτάταν* ἴμεν
ὁδὸν παρὰ Καλλιόπας λα-
 χοῖσαν *ἔξοχον* γέρας.

The summary priamel motif is present in the opening word μυρία (1),[115] and eventually a particular poet and theme must emerge from this great quantity. But the poet is in no rush, and the climax in lines 8-14 only partially fulfills the expectation. Of note in the climax are the change of person and mood, the νυν (8), and the superlative φερτάταν (12) and ἔξοχον (14). The following scheme shows how each item is specified:

μυρία κέλευθος (1) ————	φερτάταν ... ὁδόν (12-13)
μελέων (2), ὕμνοισιν (8) ————	τι καινόν (9)
ὅς ἄν (3) ————	Κηΐα μέριμνα (11), σε (12)
Μουσᾶν (4) ————	Καλλιόπας (13)
δῶρα (4) ————	ἔξοχον γέρας (14)

The *praeambulum* has done its work: out of this vast repertoire of song, the Cean bard, with Calliope's grace, will sing a new song for Athens. We are now ready to hear that song which finally specifies τι (9), and it is introduced in asyndeton. Whatever the nature of the corrupt τιηνThe (15), the theme is the flight from Argos of Inachus' daughter (18, withheld for climactic effect), who was being guarded by the monster Argos (19-28).

problems of interpreting his odes arise from a certain blurriness of thought and structure.

[115] μυρίος is a favorite word of Bacchylides and it is found as many times in his fragments as in all of Pindar.

At this point the poet pauses in a (contrived) *aporia*, as he tries to decide which version of Argos' death at the hands of Hermes to pursue. In disjunctive hymnal form he proposes three possibilities: 1) Hermes killed him [in open fight],[116] 2) Argos was exhausted by his anxieties, or 3) he was lulled to sleep by music. "For me, at any rate (ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν, 37) it is safest (ἀσφαλέστατον, 38) [to pass on to the end of the story]: Io's arrival in Egypt."[117] Whereas the opening priamel arrived at one theme out of a myriad, here several possibilities are rejected *en masse* in favor of a different approach altogether (and in this respect, it is a form of *recusatio*, a refusal to treat certain themes). The poet chooses to bypass the items in the priamel (and in this respect, it is a form of *praeteritio*)[118] in order to arrive at the Nile, completing the entire section which began with λιποῦσα (15) and ends with ἀφίκετ' ... 'Ιώ (40-41).[119]

But the reason for getting Io to Egypt is so that she can bear Epaphos (42). Here begins a genealogical catalogue (a type of priamel), which progresses from Epaphos, Antenor, Cadmus, and Semele finally to the birth of Dionysus (50), who completes the series as [lord?] of the crowned choruses. It is not certain whether or not the poem is complete at this point. At any rate, the poem employs three different priamels (the first selects a τι καινόν, the second rejects other possible themes, and the third is genealogical), in order to arrive at the birth of Dionysus, the subject of ultimate interest in this dithyramb.[120] Unless I am missing something, this is not a very successful poem. The priamels seem mechanical, and lack the *ethos* of those in *h. Hom.* 3 and the power of Pindar's. There

---

[116] H. Maehler, *Bakchylides: Lieder und Fragmente* (Berlin 1968) 105 suggests "mit dem Stein."

[117] The fact that the climax comes at the beginning of the epode reinforces its separation from the foil. Note the prominent first-personal pronoun ἐμοί (37), the adversative/transitional μὲν οὖν, and the superlative ἀσφαλέστατον (38). On the disjunctive list of possible themes, cf. above, note 50.

[118] The apology for dismissing the other themes lies in the word ἀσφαλέστατον. It is difficult to determine in just what sense Bacchylides means the word. Presumably it has to do with *decorum* (cf. πρέπει at 12).

[119] Note the postponement of the name Io (referred to by her patronymic at 18), so as to make the climax more effective.

[120] Maehler (above, note 116) 149 calls this "ein Kultlied auf Dionysos," and Jebb, *Bacchylides* (Cambridge 1905) 236 rightly notes: "Evidently Io interests Bacchylides chiefly as the ancestress of Dionysus; the god's birth is the climax towards which he hastens." The cultic hymn seems less bound to literary sophistication.

is a sort of flat facility throughout the poem, that is evident in others as well.[121]

There are three priamels in the epinician odes (14.1-22, 10.35-55, and 3.85-98). One occurs at the beginning of its ode; the other two are at the end. There are problems of form and meaning in each one, but the overall function of all is clear: to highlight the need for song to immortalize ἀρετά.[122] At 14.1-22 the poet sketches the variability of human fortune (1-6), the diversity of honors (6-7), and the great range of ἀρεταί (8),[123] before introducing the propriety of song (12-18). All of these reflections dovetail in the present (νῦν, 20) occasion in which Cleoptolemus (19) is being praised. The manner is more allusive than Pindar's, and it is more difficult to follow the train of thought, because Bacchylides adds generality to generality without clearly defining their relationship, and then leaps to the present occasion.

The priamel at 10.35-55 is also very complex. The capping term is not clearly expressed, but the priamel motif is obvious in the summary expression ματεύει / δ' ἄλλ[ος ἀλλοί]αν κέλευθον (35-36) and the following μυρίαι ... ἐπιστᾶμαι (38), which are then expanded into a list of (pre)occupations reminiscent of Solon 13.43-54.[124] We know that the poet intends to arrive, eventually, at one area of achievement: agonistic success and its celebration in song, but rather than complete the list, the poet continues with thoughts concerning the influence of fortune (τύχα, 46-47). Then comes a very difficult passage, which appears to begin another priamel (τὸ μὲν καλλιστον, 47),[125] but is cut short at line 51 with the impatient question: τί μακρὰν γ[λ]ῶ[σ]σαν ἰθύσας ἐλαύνω / ἐκτὸς ὁδοῦ; and the poet returns immediately to the present festival with the need to

---

[121] One makes judgments of this sort with great caution and considerable deference. The suspicion always lingers that the "flatness" really lies in the critic's own sensibility.

[122] Cf. 14.20-21 (νῦν χρὴ...κελαδῆσαι) 10.53-55 (αὐλῶν ... χρή), and the variation at 3.95-96 (οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον σι]ω- / πά = χρὴ κελαδῆσαι).

[123] Note the perfect summary form of the priamel in lines 8-9: μυρί]αι δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀρε[ταί,] μία δ' ἐ[κ / πασᾶ]ν πρόκειται.

[124] Cf. Jebb (above, note 120) 319.

[125] For other priamels which begin with a superlative with μέν, cf. Pindar O. 1.1 and Bacch. 14.1-2 (Εὖ μὲν εἱμάρθαι ... ἄριστον). At 10.47 ff., Bacchylides does not answer the μέν with a δέ, but instead adds (καί, 49) the observation that wealth also has great power. Wealth as foil for agonistic success is common in epinician poetry, but the *form* of Bacchylides' thought is not clear here.

celebrate the victory.[126] As in the previous example, the general reflections serve as background for the present celebration, but the sequence of one thought to another is not entirely clear.

The best-known priamel in Bacchylides occurs at 3.85 ff., and is usually considered a poor imitation of the proem to Pindar's O. 1.

φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω· βαθὺς μὲν
αἰθὴρ ἀμίαντος· ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου
οὐ σάπεται· εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός·
    ἀνδρὶ δ' οὐ θέμις, πολιὸν π[αρ]έντα
γῆρας, θάλ[εια]ν αὖτις ἀγκομίσσαι
ἥβαν. ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει
βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ
    Μοῦσά νιν τρ[έφει.] Ἱέρων, σὺ δ' ὄλβου
κάλλιστ' ἐπεδ[είξ]αο θνατοῖς
  ἄνθεα· πράξα[ντι] δ' εὖ
οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον σι]ω-
  πά· σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[είᾳ] καλῶν
καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν
  Κηΐας ἀηδόνος.

Apart from the fact that the elements air, water, and gold are mentioned in both passages, Bacchylides' priamel is totally different. It begins with a "word to the wise" φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω (85).[127] Here Bacchylides is reminding Hieron of the impermanence of human existence in contrast to the durability of his achievements. In order to set into relief the fact that man is mortal, the poet sketches the three natural realms by listing air, sea, and gold with their essential attributes, which contrast with man's condition: ἀνδρὶ δ' (88) introduces the new and contrasting category. The priamel has done its work to highlight man's mortality, and this can then be contrasted with a new category (ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]έν, 90), which is given permanence by the Muse. This is followed by direct praise of Hieron's ἀρεταί (92-96) and the assurance that Bacchylides' song will endure (96-98). The general drift of the passage is clear, and its message is a commonplace in epinician poetry. But once again,

---

[126] Jebb (above, note 120) 320 takes the question to mean: "The poet apologizes for the irrelevance of the gnomic passage beginning with ματεύει in v. 35." That is surely too inclusive. I think, rather, that the question cuts short the new sequence beginning at 47. With his abrupt question he can brush aside any considerations of wealth and get right to the celebration at hand.

[127] The correct parallel for this passage is Hes. *Op.* 202: νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς, not Pindar O. 2.85 (φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν).

Bacchylides' allusive manner—he does not specify the relationship between the elements and man—and staccato phrasing present more of a riddle than a clear statement such as that of O. 1.1 ff. Pindar's obscurity results from extreme compression; Bacchylides' from extreme suggestiveness.

12. *Timotheus*

At the end of his *Persians* the poet defends his musical innovations by placing himself at the end of a short list of innovators (221-229): first was Orpheus, then Terpander, and now Timotheus (νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος, 229). The extent to which one assigns an adversative force to the δέ will determine the amount of pride present in the statement; it is purposely ambiguous.

In what is perhaps a parody of this passage, the comic playwright Pherecrates has Poetry complain to Justice about her outrageous treatment at the hands of various poets (Melanippides, Cinesias, Phrynis), and the list culminates in Timotheus, who is the worst of all (*fr.* 145, Kock i 188):

> ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεος μ', ὦ φιλτάτη, κατορώρυχεν
> καὶ διακέκναικ' αἴσχιστα.

Here the δέ (19) is unambiguously adversative.

13. *Lyr. Gr. Frag. Adesp. 138 (Bergk)*

Preserved at the end of Plato *Epis.* 1.310a4-10 is a charming priamel, to whose climax Plato could readily assent, for it singles out the νόησις of good men in agreement as more rare than gold, more attractive than diamonds or silver, and more self-sufficient than fertile fields. By using the negative form (οὐ ... οὐδὲ ... οὐδὲ ... ὡς) the poet can withhold the key word until the very last.

> οὐ χρυσὸς ἀγλαὸς σπανιώτατος ἐν θνατῶν δυσελπί-
> στῳ βίῳ,
> οὐδ' ἀδάμας οὐδ' ἀργύρου κλῖναι πρὸς ἄνθρωπον
> δοκιμαζόμεν' ἀστράπτει πρὸς ὄψεις·
> οὐδὲ γαίας εὐρυπέδου γόνιμοι βρίθοντες αὐτάρκεις
> γύαι,
> *ὡς ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ὁμοφράδμων νόησις.*

C. TRAGEDY

1. *Aeschylus*

There are several priamels of note in the extant tragedies of Aeschylus, and they show considerable variety of form and content. At *Aga.* 1008-1021 occurs a priamel whose point is the irrevocability of human life.[128]

καὶ πρὸ μέν τι χρημάτων
κτησίων ὄκνος βαλὼν
σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου—
οὐκ ἔδυ πρόπας δόμος
πλησμονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν,
οὐδ' ἐπόντισε σκάφος.
πολλά τοι δόσις ἐκ Διὸς ἀμφιλα-
φής τε καὶ ἐξ ἀλόκων ἐπετειᾶν
νῆστιν ὤλεσεν νόσον,

τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γᾶν πεσὸν ἅπαξ ἀντ.β.
θανάσιμον πρόπαρ ἀνδρὸς
μέλαν *αἷμα τίς* ἂν
πάλιν ἀγκαλέσαιτ' ἐπαείδων;

The contrast is drawn between a ship, which can be saved by jettisoning some cargo (1008-1013), a bountiful crop, which can stave off famine (1014-1016), and human lifeblood (1017-1021). In the case of shipwreck and famine, there is a *degree* of salvation possible, whereas in the case of human life (adversative δέ, 1017, the new subject introduced before the question,[129] and αἷμα, 1020 withheld for effect), "who could recall it?" (τίς; = οὐδείς).

At *Supp.* 946-949 Pelasgus employs a brief priamel at the close of his impassioned speech to the Egyptian herald:

ταῦτ' οὐ πίναξίν ἐστιν ἐγγεγραμμένα
οὐδ' ἐν πτυχαῖς βίβλων κατεσφραγισμένα,
σαφῆ δ' ἀκούεις ἐξ ἐλευθεροστόμου
γλώσσης.

Here the rhetorical scheme of "not A, nor B, but C" is obvious,

---

[128] Van Otterlo (*Intro.*, n. 9) 164-167 was the first to point out a group of priamels on this theme, including also *Il.* 9.406-409 and Aesch. *Supp.* 443-451. At Aesch. *Eum.* 644-648 it occurs in summary form (cf. χάρτα πολλή, 646).

[129] On the word order of this passage, cf. E. Fraenkel (*Intro.*, n. 10) 459-460. The question regularly (but not necessarily) follows the introduction of the new subject. Cf. Aesch. *Choe.* 594-595 and Soph. *Trach.* 503-504, both discussed below.

and may appear somewhat labored, but what Pelasgus is stressing is the fact that the decision of his people is not a dead letter written down and sealed away somewhere, but is clearly evident (σαφῆ, 948 emphatic) on the tongue of a free man, whose living, *oral* force is expressed in his abrupt and succinct command to the herald: κομίζου δ' ὡς τάχιστ' ἐξ ὀμμάτων (949). Pelasgus might have said all this more straightforwardly and economically, but the priamel, by stopping the action, allows us to contemplate the vitality of law in the hearts of the Argives.

At *Pers.* 176-180 Atossa uses a summary priamel to introduce her recent dream, and in his great speech to her, the ghost of Darius employs an "historical" priamel (*Pers.* 759-786), in which he lists all the Persian kings from Medus to Xerxes in order to prove that all of them together (ἅπαντες, 785) did not do as much harm as Xerxes. By using the priamel in this way, he combines the intellectual proof of his assertion with the emotional heightening of the present disaster, unprecedented in the long and glorious history of the Persian empire.

In a similar fashion, Eteocles at *Sept.* 662-669 uses a priamel to prove that it is unlikely that Polyneices has Dike on his side, by an inductive review of his past. Here, however, the logic of the priamel is that of an *argumentum a fortiori*. At no time in the past (at birth, 664; during childhood, 665; in early manhood, 665; nor in maturity, 666) was he the favorite of Justice, *but* (οὐδ', 668 is undoubtedly correct) when he is doing evil to his fatherland, she *certainly* (μήν, 668)[130] is not *now* (νῦν, 669) on his side. Polyneices' attack is, as it were, the crowning example of his lifelong ἀδικία, and the priamel gives it rhetorical, logical, and emotional force.[131]

---

[130] On μήν cf. Denniston, GP, 340 and especially Smyth 2921.

[131] In the same play in lines 375-632, there is a sense in which the list of the seven chieftains (culminating in the pair of brothers) is a priamel, but with the exception of the δή at 631, there is no other indication that we should consider it *formally* a priamel. At the end of the *Choephori* occurs what might be called a truncated priamel. The chorus sums up the three disasters which have befallen the house of Atreus, culminating in the latest (νῦν δ' αὖ τρίτος, 1073), but it is not sure if this present one will be the last. In other words, the list remains open-ended, and the question remains:

> ποῖ δῆτα κρανεῖ, ποῖ καταλήξει
> μετακοιμισθὲν μένος ἄτης;

It is, as it were, a potential priamel awaiting its conclusion (κρανεῖ, 1075) and completion (καταλήξει, 1075). It now exists as a mere catalogue. Will there be an

But by far the most impressive priamel in Aeschylus, and one which is frequently compared with Sophocles' "Ode to Man"[132] occurs at *Choe.* 585 ff.:

Χο. *πολλὰ* μὲν γᾶ τρέφει   στρ.
δεινὰ δειμάτων ἄχη,
πόντιαί τ' ἀγκάλαι κνωδάλων
ἀνταίων βρύουσι, [πλά-
θουσι] βλαστοῦσι καὶ πεδαίχμιοι
λαμπάδες πεδάοροι,
πτανά τε καὶ πεδοβάμονα κἀνεμόεντ' ἂν
αἰγίδων φράσαι κότον.

ἀλλ' ὑπέρτολμον ἀν-   ἀντ.
δρὸς φρόνημα *τίς* λέγοι
καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσὶν τλημόνων
παντόλμους ἔρωτας, ἄ-
ταισι συννόμους βροτῶν;
συζύγους δ' ὁμαυλίας
θηλυκρατὴς ἀπέρωτος *ἔρως* παρανικᾷ
κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν.

As at *Ant.* 332, the ode is concerned with δεινά (here further qualified by ἄχη, 586), but instead of arriving in summary fashion at his main topic, Aeschylus expands πολλά (585) into horrors of land, sea, and air (585-593). Of these one could tell (φράσαι, 593), *but* (ἀλλά, 594)[133] who (τίς = οὐδείς) could tell of man's boldness (foil) and women's loves which stop at nothing? This is specified even further in the following lines as that θηλυκρατὴς ... ἔρως which overmasters marriages.

These two strophes, which are as complex as many priamels in Pindar, have two main functions. The first is to introduce the subject of the ode: the boundless passion of women which destroys marriages. The second is to put it in a context which will amplify its horror. The first context is the natural world, including monsters of the earth (γᾶ, 585) and those in the sea (πόντιαί τ' ἀγκάλαι, 587). To

---

analogue to give it formal completion? The climax is, of course, provided by the *Eumenides* itself.

[132] These two odes are very different, both in form and in content. In fact, the only similarity they really share is the expression πολλὰ ... δεινά. On Soph. *Ant.* 332 ff., cf. *Intro.*, pp. 13-17.

[133] Note that the climax comes at the beginning of the antistrophe. There is, of course, a natural tendency for metrical forms to emphasize rhetorical ones. This is true of hexameters, iambics, and elegiacs as well as of lyric meters.

complete the sketch of nature, he includes meteors in the atmosphere and hurricanes, to whose force those who walk and those who fly can attest. The adversative ἀλλά (594) contrasts the world of nature with that of man, where destruction (ἄταισι, 598) is wrought by excessive boldness in men and passion in females—whether animals or, climactically, human (βροτῶν, 601).[134]

The poet has narrowed his subject from πολλὰ ... δεινὰ ... ἄχη (585-586) to the παντόλμους ἔρωτας (597) of women, which the following strophes further particularize by giving specific examples. First is Althaea (602-611), second is Scylla (612-622), and third (after a very corrupt strophe) is the example toward which this new priamel is tending. It begins (631 f.):

κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Λήμνιον
λόγῳ·

It comes as no surprise that the crowning example should be the Lemnian women, who murdered their husbands. The chorus is too discreet to add a καὶ νῦν, but the inference is clear: Clytemnestra's fame will rival that of the Lemnian women. Thus, in this grand ode, all the horrors of nature, of man, and of legend are summoned to give depth and emphasis to the unspeakable crimes of Clytemnestra (love for Aegisthus and murder of Agamemnon), which will be expiated with Orestes' subsequent knocking at the door of the palace (652).

2. *Sophocles*

There are several important priamels in Sophocles' extant drama besides the opening of the "Ode to Man." One shows how a *praeteritio* is essentially a species of priamel. At *Trach.* 497-506, the chorus intends to sing of the contest between Heracles and Achelous for the hand of Deianira, but instead of beginning immediately with the subject, they "bypass" (παρέβαν, 499) the greater themes, which then provide a cosmic context for the particular contest.

[134] Cf. Eur. *fr.* 1059:

δεινὴ μὲν ἀλκὴ κυμάτων θαλασσίων,
δειναὶ δὲ ποταμῶν καὶ πυρὸς θερμοῦ πνοαί,
δεινὸν δὲ πενία, δεινὰ δ' ἄλλα μυρία,
ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτω δεινὸν ὡς γυνὴ κακόν·

Note the polyptoton, the summary before the climax, the postponement of γυνή, and the remarkable periphrasis of the superlative (οὐδὲν οὕτω δεινὸν ὡς = δεινότατον).

Χο. μέγα τι σθένος ἁ Κύπρις ἐκφέρεται στρ.
νίκας ἀεί.
καὶ τὰ μὲν θεῶν
παρέβαν, καὶ ὅπως Κρονίδαν ἀπάτα-
σεν οὐ λέγω,
οὐδὲ τὸν ἔννυχον Ἅιδαν,
ἢ Ποσειδάωνα τινάκτορα γαίας·
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τάνδ' ἄρ' ἄκοιτιν
<τίνες> ἀμφίγυοι κατέβαν πρὸ γάμων,
τίνες πάμπληκτα παγκόνιτά τ' ἐξ-
ῆλθον ἄεθλ' ἀγώνων;

The word νίκας (497) suggests the context, while the summary word ἀεί (498), the temporal equivalent of πᾶς, provides the quantitative motif, which invites further specification.[135] First comes the power of Aphrodite over the gods (τὰ ... θεῶν, 498), of whom three examples are given: Zeus, Hades, and Poseidon (i.e., the entire universe).[136] But it is not about them that the chorus wishes to speak, and even as they list them, they disclaim them as the ultimate theme of their song (cf. μέν, 498; παρέβαν, 499; οὐ λέγω, 500). As frequently occurs in priamel, a list of examples is—as a group—capped by one from another category.[137] It is not the gods overcome by Aphrodite, but the contestants for *this* bride: *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τάνδ' ἄρ' ἄκοιτιν* (503). The ἀλλά rejects the earlier category as foil and introduces the topic of present concern (cf. τάνδε, 503). The chorus, however, still delays the introduction of the two combatants with the epic question: τίνες ... κατέβαν; (504).[138] Thus the entire strophe (497-506) serves as an elaborate *prooimion* to the description of the contest (and, ultimately, to the description of the forlorn Deianira awaiting the outcome at 523-530). The passage exemplifies the frequent use of a priamel at the beginning of a choral ode to sketch the extensive scope of the subject (here the victories of Aphrodite) before coming to the specific instance.[139]

---

[135] Cf. the opening of Soph. *Ajax*, where the summary ἀεὶ μέν (1) is contrasted with the present instance καὶ νῦν.

[136] Cf. J. C. Kamerbeek, *The Trachiniae* (Leiden 1959) 118.

[137] Cf. *h. Hom.* 3.207-219, Pindar I. 7.1-21 (they are old), I. 1.47-51, Solon 13.43-63W, and Sappho *fr.* 16.1-4, to mention a few.

[138] Note that the question follows the new subject.

[139] This same effect is intended in the opening hymnal priamels of Pindar's odes, of which O. 12 and I. 5 are good examples.

In the great speech of the suffering Heracles at *Trach.* 1046-1111, Sophocles uses three priamels to heighten the *pathos*. It opens with the summary πολλά (1046-1052):

Ηρ. *ὦ πολλὰ δὴ* καὶ θερμὰ καὶ λόγῳ κακὰ
καὶ χερσὶ καὶ νώτοισι μοχθήσας ἐγώ·
κοὔπω τοιοῦτον οὔτ' ἄκοιτις ἡ Διὸς
προύθηκεν οὔθ' ὁ στυγνὸς Εὐρυσθεὺς ἐμοὶ
οἷον τόδ' ἡ δολῶπις Οἰνέως κόρη
καθῆψεν ὤμοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς Ἐρινύων
ὑφαντὸν ἀμφίβληστρον, ᾧ διόλλυμαι.

The point of interest is, of course, the many θερμά[140] and κακά that he has suffered in toiling with hands and back. The δή (1046) emphasizes the great amount, and the polysyndeton further reinforces it. The καί (1048) with the negative is adversative, and the logic is very similar to the opening of the "Ode to Man." There: "many the wonders, but nothing (κοὐδέν, 332) is more wonderful than man"; here: "many indeed the hardships, but never (κοὔπω, 1048) one such as this." But this passage is more complex than that from *Antigone*, for Sophocles develops a contrast between the suffering imposed on him by others (Hera and Eurystheus) and that by Deianira. In addition, there is the contrast between χερσί and νώτοισι (1047) and ὤμοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς (1051). Thus, out of a context of great suffering inflicted on his body by others, this one (τόδε, 1050) emerges as the most terrible (οὔπω τοιοῦτον ... οἷον, 1048-1050), even to the point of destroying him (ᾧ διόλλυμαι, 1052). The series of contrasts and the rhetorical ὑπεροχή of the climax make this an impressive priamel.

A second priamel with a similar purpose amplifies the *pathos* by contrasting the incredible accomplishment of Deianira with the great combats to which Heracles was accustomed (*Trach.* 1058-1063):

κοὐ ταῦτα λόγχη πεδιάς, οὔθ' ὁ γηγενὴς
στρατὸς Γιγάντων, οὔτε θήρειος βία,
οὔθ' Ἑλλάς, οὔτ' ἄγλωσσος, οὔθ' *ὅσην* ἐγὼ
γαῖαν καθαίρων ἱκόμην, ἔδρασέ πω·
γυνὴ δέ, θῆλυς οὖσα κοὐκ ἀνδρὸς φύσις,
μόνη με δὴ καθεῖλε φασγάνου δίχα.

---

[140] The θερμά are both metaphorical and actual, as is the play on χέρες at 1089.

"Not spears, not Giants, no wild beast, neither Greece nor barbarian land, nor *all* (ὅσην, 1060) the land which I purified accomplished this *ever* (πω, 1061)." Note the summary motifs with which the list ends (ὅσην)[141] and the climactically withheld (and pathetic) πω. These are then contrasted *as a group* with the climax: γυνὴ δέ... (1062-1063). Note the superlative force of μόνη (reinforced by δή, 1063).[142]

The third priamel in the speech (1089-1106) begins with an address to his hands, ὦ χέρες χέρες (1089) and proceeds to list the labors in which he was once (ποτέ, 1091) so successful. The catalogue ends with the words ἐν ἐσχάτοις τόποις (1100)[143] and is followed by a summary before the climax (1101-1106):

> ἄλλων τε μόχθων μυρίων ἐγευσάμην,
> κοὐδεὶς τροπαῖ' ἔστησε τῶν ἐμῶν χερῶν.
> νῦν δ' ὧδ' ἄναρθρος καὶ κατερρακωμένος
> τυφλῆς ὑπ' ἄτης ἐκπεπόρθημαι τάλας,
> ὁ τῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὠνομασμένος,
> ὁ τοῦ κατ' ἄστρα Ζηνὸς αὐδηθεὶς γόνος.

Lines 1101-1102 sum up the other countless (μυρίων, 1101) toils he underwent, but no one (κοὐδείς, 1102)[144] prevailed over his hands.[145] This summary makes the following climax more powerful, as Heracles contrasts the countless number of his previous victories with his present, lamentable state: νῦν δ' ὧδε (1103).[146] Throughout Heracles' speech (a *lamentatio*) is the rhetorical amplification of *pathos* by means of contrast (ἀντεξέτασις)[147] and the three priamels which we have examined lend force and verisimilitude to these contrasts.

---

[141] Kamerbeek (above, note 136) 221 correctly glosses οὔθ' ὅσην ... γαῖαν as οὔτε πᾶσα γαῖα ἥντινα.

[142] μόνη means primarily "alone" in this passage, but there is also a sense of "only," which is the usual force of the word in the climax of a priamel. For both meanings, cf. [Theoc.] 20.42 and 45. For a reworking of the same material (with a different conclusion) cf. Sen. *H.O.* 1166-1173.

[143] On superlatives ending catalogues, cf. *Intro.* pp. 25-26.

[144] This is the third example of adversative καί in Sophocles (cf. *Ant.* 332 and *Trach.* 1048).

[145] Line 1102 is an elaborate way of saying "but I always won," but by using the word χερῶν the poet rounds off the catalogue which began with ὦ χέρες χέρες (1089) and prepares for the climax.

[146] Note the deictic force of these words.

[147] Cf. Apsines περὶ πάθους (*Rh. Gr.* 1.327.8 ff., S.-H.), who gives an example which is a form of priamel: οὐδὲν τοσοῦτον ἡ λοιμώδης νόσος, οὐχ ἡ Σικελία ἤνεγκε ταῖς 'Αθήναις πάθος, ὅσον οἱ τριάκοντα. His entire section on *pathos* is à propos.

In his great speech before going off to commit suicide (646-692), Ajax uses two priamels, which might be called "inductive" since they adduce examples, the sum of whose force applies in the present instance. This type of reasoning is most frequent in deliberative rhetoric,[148] and manifests calm and logical deliberation. Such priamels have the opposite effect of those in Heracles' speech, for they often serve to allay passion, and (like their forerunner at *Il.* 5.382-405) can have a consolatory intention. His speech begins (646-650):

Αι. *ἅπανθ' ὁ μακρὸς κἀναρίθμητος χρόνος*
φύει τ' ἄδηλα καὶ φανέντα κρύπτεται·
κοὐκ ἔστ' ἄελπτον οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἁλίσκεται
χὠ δεινὸς ὅρκος χαἰ περισκελεῖς φρένες.
κἀγὼ γάρ, ὃς τὰ δείν' ἐκαρτέρουν τότε...

In these opening lines, Ajax is explaining his change of attitude, and to do so he constructs a priamel which sketches the general alternation of nature in order to create a verisimilar background for the present situation. Beginning with the broadest summary (ἅπανθ', 646; ἀναρίθμητος, 646) he depicts the comings and goings of natural things, and draws the conclusion that οὐκ ἔστ' ἄελπτον οὐδέν (648). This broad context is further specified with two examples from *human* actions, which, of course, have direct bearing on the issue at hand: dire oaths and hardened hearts. This is then all brought to bear on the present situation of the speaker: κἀγὼ γάρ... (650 ff.).[149] By placing his change of heart in this general context, Ajax seeks to allay the fears of the chorus and Tecmessa by making his actions credible (he has carefully chosen the expression οὐκ ... ἄελπτον, 648). With such an introduction, he can announce confidently that he is going off to the shore (ἀλλ' εἶμι ... 654).

Further on in the same speech, Ajax concludes that he must yield to the gods and to the Atreidae (666-668), and to justify his decision, he resorts to a priamel, which, like the one that opened his speech, sets his decision in a general context in order to justify it. It begins, as usual, in the most general terms: "Fearsome and mighty things yield to authority." Then follows a list of examples from

---

[148] On the use of examples in deliberative oratory, cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1.9.40. Krischer (*Intro.* n. 18) 86-87 discusses the priamel, which he categorizes as "generalisierende." Cf. above, note 15.

[149] On καὶ γάρ as an instance in an inductive proof, cf. Denniston, GP, 66 (8).

nature which illustrate this principle (τοῦτο, 670 = οὕτως): winter yields to summer, night to day, storm to calm, and sleep to waking. Then comes the climax (677):

ἡμεῖς δὲ πῶς οὐ γνωσόμεσθα σωφρονεῖν;

The personal pronoun ἡμεῖς, the copulative δέ, and the following rhetorical question πῶς οὐ (= οὕτως) complete the logic of the priamel. This form, which begins with a general proposition ("the mightiest things yield to authority," 666-668) illustrated with several examples (669-676), and then returns to the case in point (677), becomes a stereotyped form in Latin elegiac poetry, as this example from Ovid, *Ex P.* 1.5.35-41 demonstrates:[150]

gnome	scilicet est cupidus studiorum *quisque suorum* tempus et adsueta ponere in arte iuvat.
examples	saucius eiurat pugnam gladiator, et idem immemor antiqui vulneris arma capit. nil sibi cum pelagi dicit fore naufragus undis, et ducit remos qua modo navit aqua.
application	*sic ego* constanter studium non utile servo...

Very frequently this form is used with a hortatory intention, or to lend credibility to one's actions. But unlike the Latin examples, this passage from the *Ajax* maintains gravity and heroism.[151]

3. *Euripides*

There are none of the grand priamels in Euripides such as those in Aeschylus (*Choe.* 585 ff.) and Sophocles (*Ajax* 646 ff.). There are, however, numerous minor ones, and we shall use examples from the *Medea* to illustrate the major types.

Medea's deliberations on which method to employ to destroy her Corinthian rival (376-385) show how a priamel can be used in a formal ἀπορία (*dubitatio*), where several options are considered before the correct one is reached.[152]

---

[150] Cf. Prop. 3.9.7-22, Ovid *Ex P.* 2.5.59-64, 2.7.7-16, 4.1.28-36, *Tr.* 4.6.29-38, 5.12.21-30, and *R.A.* 441-452.

[151] Cf. W. B. Stanford, *Ajax* (New York 1963) 147: "The effect of Ajax's analogy between his own destiny and that inherent in the inexorable forces of nature is to give a greater amplitude to his own spirit and to raise the whole story of his personal disaster to a level of almost cosmic significance."

[152] This device is most commonly used by an author in selecting the appropriate theme. Cf. Bundy (1972) 47 n. 32 and 58-71, who fully discusses what he calls "aporetic (or rhapsodic) selection priamels." In this passage in the *Medea* the traditional form is given a most sinister content.

πολλὰς δ' ἔχουσα θανασίμους αὐτοῖς ὁδούς,
οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποίᾳ πρῶτον ἐγχειρῶ, φίλαι·
πότερον ὑφάψω δῶμα νυμφικὸν πυρί,
ἢ θηκτὸν ὤσω φάσγανον δι' ἥπατος,
σιγῇ δόμους ἐσβᾶσ', ἵν' ἔστρωται λέχος.
ἀλλ' ἕν τί μοι πρόσαντες· εἰ ληφθήσομαι
δόμους ὑπεσβαίνουσα καὶ τεχνωμένη,
θανοῦσα θήσω τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐχθροῖς γέλων.
κράτιστα τὴν εὐθεῖαν, ᾗ πεφύκαμεν
σοφαὶ *μάλιστα, φαρμάκοις* αὐτοὺς ἑλεῖν.

The emphatic πολλάς (376) is specified with two possibilities, fire or sword, but they are both ruled out on the grounds that they require her physical presence in the palace and she might get caught before accomplishing anything. Then comes the real choice (384-385). The emphatic κράτιστα, 384 (in adversative asyndeton for striking effect), and the superlative μάλιστα (385) give finality to her decision, and as often, the key word (here φαρμάκοις, 385) is withheld for climactic effect.[153] The priamel delays the decision and makes the effect of her final resolution all the greater.

Medea uses another priamel at 469-472 during her first argument with Jason, but here it gives emphasis and clarity to a single word, lest there be any misunderstanding about its meaning.

οὔτοι θράσος τόδ' ἐστὶν *οὐδ'* εὐτολμία,
φίλους κακῶς δράσαντ' ἐναντίον βλέπειν,
ἀλλ' ἡ μεγίστη τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις νόσων
πασῶν, ἀναίδει'·

"*Not* θράσος, *nor* εὐτολμία, for you to show your face, *but* the *worst* of *all* human ills: ἀναίδεια."[154]

Further on in the same episode, Jason claims that as a benefit of their marriage Medea has a reputation for wisdom throughout Greece. In order to amplify the importance of fame, he uses a priamel (542-544):

εἴη δ' ἔμοιγε *μήτε* χρυσὸς ἐν δόμοις
μήτ' 'Ορφέως κάλλιον ὑμνῆσαι μέλος,
εἰ μὴ 'πίσημος ἡ τύχη *γένοιτό μοι.*

---

[153] This entire passage is a dreadful parody of Pindaric *aporiai*, in which the poet decides to proceed by means of straightforward natural ability. Cf. N. 1.25-26: τέχναι δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι· χρὴ δ' ἐν *εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς* στείχοντα μάρνασθαι *φυᾷ*; O. 9.100: τὸ δὲ *φυᾷ κράτιστον* ἅπαν; and O. 2.86: *σοφὸς* ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς *φυᾷ*.

[154] Cf. above, note 18.

Such priamels, which through contrast lead up to the speaker's προαίρεσις, are very common.[155] Akin to the *recusatio* (in the broad sense of the word), this type of priamel "rejects" items normally considered desirable in favor of the author's choice. Regular features of this type include the first person and a verb of disapproval, generally accompanied by an optative. Other examples in Euripides include *Ion* 485-491 (in praise of εὐπαιδία; note the first person, optative, and ἀποστυγῶ, 488), *H.F.* 643-648 (in praise of youth; note μή μοι ... εἴη, 643-644, which combines all three elements), and the elaborate example in a fragment from the *Rhadamanthys* (659 N2):

ἔρωτες ἡμῖν εἰσὶ παντοῖοι βίου·
ὃ μὲν γὰρ εὐγένειαν ἱμείρει λαβεῖν,
τῷ δ' οὐχὶ τούτου φροντίς, ἀλλὰ χρημάτων
πολλῶν κεκλῆσθαι βούλεται πάτωρ δόμοις·
ἄλλῳ δ' ἀρέσκει μηδὲν ὑγιὲς ἐκ φρενῶν
λέγοντι πείθειν τοὺς πέλας τόλμῃ κακῇ·
οἳ δ' αἰσχρὰ κέρδη πρόσθε τοῦ καλοῦ βροτῶν
ζητοῦσιν· οὕτω βίοτος ἀνθρώπων πλάνη.
ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων οὐδενὸς χρῄζω τυχεῖν,
δόξαν <δὲ> *βουλοίμην* ἂν *εὐκλείας* ἔχειν.

Finally, the closing words of the play (1415-1419), a standard formula for the chorus to utter (cf. *Alc.*, *Hel.*, *Andr.*, and *Bacch.*), are in the form of a summary priamel:

Χο. *πολλῶν* ταμίας Ζεὺς ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ,
πολλὰ δ' ἀέλπτως κραίνουσι θεοί·
καὶ τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη,
τῶν δ' ἀδοκήτων πόρον ηὗρε θεός.
τοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα.

The emphatic πολλῶν (1415) summarizes the manifold things under Zeus' stewardship, and the succeeding πολλά (1416), more particularized, summarizes the element of surprise,[156] whereby the gods frustrate the expected and fulfill the unexpected. Against this background of numerous reversals brought about by the gods, comes the cap: τοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα (1419). The τοιόνδε provides an analogous instance of the general condition sketched in the

[155] E.g. Tyrt. 12W and [Theoc.] 8.53-56. Cf. Schmid (*Intro.* n. 13) 42-44.

[156] These lines contain two outstanding features of tragedy later discussed by Aristotle in his *Poetics*: surprise (τὸ θαυμαστόν) and reversal (περιπέτεια). On the relation of this passage to a "break-off" formula, cf. Bundy (1972) 54-55 n. 52.

preceding lines, and the deictic τόδε points to the concrete example, the *hic et nunc*, the play itself (τόδε πρᾶγμα). This priamel not only focuses our minds on the outcome (ἀπέβη) of the play which we have just witnessed, but also provides the universal context within which it must be viewed. It is the ability of the priamel to link the universal and the concrete that makes this ending, detachable as it is, so powerful, for the mind is forced to go back and discern the typicality (τοιόνδε) of this particular action (πρᾶγμα).

Euripides can also use a similar form to begin a play. His *Sthenoboea* opens with a general principle (D. L. Page, *LP*, p. 126):

> οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις *πάντ'* ἀνὴρ εὐδαιμονεῖ·

which is then specified by three examples: 1) either one is of good birth, but poor; 2) or lowly, but rich; 3) or both well-born and rich, but put to shame by a silly wife. The emphatic πολλούς (4) indicates that there are numerous examples of the last, of which the present play presents one instance (5):[157]

> *τοιᾷδε Προῖτος* γῆς ἄναξ νόσῳ νοσεῖ.

Although there are many other priamels in Euripides,[158] there is no point in detailed treatment, and we may turn to one last example, which has a *Nachleben* in Roman comedy.[159] At *Alc.* 747 ff., the servant who has been tending Heracles delivers a monologue which begins with a summary priamel (747-750):

> *πολλοὺς* μὲν ἤδη κἀπὸ *παντοίας* χθονὸς
> ξένους μολόντας οἶδ' ἐς 'Αδμήτου δόμους,
> οἷς δεῖπνα προύθηκ'· *ἀλλὰ τοῦδ' οὔπω* ξένου
> *κακίον'* ἐς *τήνδ'* ἑστίαν ἐδεξάμην.

The emphatic πολλούς is amplified by παντοίας (747), and the climax, introduced by ἀλλά (749) singles out *this* guest (τοῦδ', 749) as the *worst* (οὐ ... κακίονα, 749-750) ever (οὔπω, 749 picks up the ἤδη at 747), to be entertained at *this* (τάνδ', 750) hearth. After this impressive opening, the servant explains, in the following relative clause, the reasons for this evaluation.

---

[157] Cf. the burlesque of this passage at Aristoph. *Frogs* 1217-1219, where Aeschylus cuts short the priamel with his notorious ληκύθιον ἀπώλεσεν.

[158] E.g. *Hipp.* 916-920, *Hel.* 375-385, 397-400, *Bacch.* 902-911, *Supp.* 234-246, 1118-1122, *El.* 163-167, 175-182, *Hec.* 623-628, 864-869, *Rhe.* 497-500, *fr.* 282.1-2 (a summary priamel) and *fr.* 316.

[159] Cf. *infra* pp. 114-115.

D. HELLENISTIC LITERATURE

1. *Callimachus*

In his adaptations of the Homeric hymns to Hellenistic taste, Callimachus retains many of the earlier forms, including priamels, but he also alters them in several ways. First of all, he reduces their size; gone are the great priamels of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*. Instead, he prefers just two or three terms as foil. Second, he integrates the priamels into the text more completely, so that they are less detachable, by beginning and ending them in mid-line. And third, he makes them more logical by appending explanatory clauses to them. All of these are in accord with Hellenistic aesthetics, which prefer the small, carefully controlled effect to the grand gesture of the more oral and archaic rhapsodic tradition. For example, when he imitates the priamel at *h. Hom.* 3.19-25 (cf. *supra* p. 48) in his *Hymn to Delos* 28-30:

εἰ δὲ *λίην πολέες* σε περιτροχόωσιν ἀοιδαί,
ποίῃ ἐνιπλέξω σε; τί τοι θυμῆρες ἀκοῦσαι;
ἢ *ὡς τὰ πρώτιστα* μέγας θεὸς οὔρεα θείνων...

gone is the grand sweep of the Homeric geographical survey, and the whole is condensed to three lines. Similarly, in the opening of his *Hymn to Zeus*, Callimachus adapts the priamel at *h. Hom.* 1.1-6 (which rejects the claims of other cities as the birthplace of Dionysus with ψευδόμενοι, 6) by deliberating between Crete and Arcadia as the birthplace of Zeus, and eliminates Crete with the pronouncement Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται (8). This leaves Arcadia by default, which he then picks up in lines 10 ff. But in the meantime, he "proves" his assertion that Cretans always lie with two γάρ-clauses, which together form an enthymeme: they built a tomb for you, but you haven't died (since you always exist); therefore they are liars. While the author of the Homeric hymn confidently rejected the other cities and proceeded to make his choice, Callimachus feels compelled to employ a bit of logical juggling to "prove" that Cretans are liars by adducing an example. There is wit in this procedure, but this cleverness ultimately weakens the force of his choice when he does broach his subject.[160]

---

[160] This same tendency can be seen at the end of the *Hymn to Zeus*, when in 91 ff. he bids farewell to the god, and excuses himself from continuing by citing the greatness of the theme (92): τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδοι; Normally the interrogative

At *h. Zeus* 66 ff., Callimachus begins listing the attributes which Zeus has chosen for himself: might, strength, and the eagle. At 70 he states that Zeus has chosen the most important thing among men. Then follows a list of those whom he did not choose (70-71):

εἵλεο δ' αἰζηῶν ὅ τι φέρτατον· οὐ σύ γε νηῶν
ἐμπεράμους, οὐχ ἄνδρα σακέσπαλον, οὐ μὲν ἀοιδόν·

These are then summed up in the following lines (72-73), so as to contrast more effectively with the climax (73), which is then augmented with a list (74-75), finally summed up by πάντα (75) and reinforced by stating the same proposition in different terms (τί δ' οὐ = πάντα, 75).

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μακάρεσσιν ὀλίζοσιν αὖθι παρῆκας
ἄλλα μέλειν ἑτέροισι, σὺ δ' ἐξέλεο πτολιάρχους
αὐτούς, ὧν ὑπὸ χεῖρα γεωμόρος, ὧν ἴδρις αἰχμῆς,
ὧν ἐρέτης, ὧν πάντα· τί δ' οὐ κρατέοντος ὑπ' ἰσχύν;

Having thus amplified the superiority of rulers over everyone else, he returns to his main point (the stewardship of Zeus over kings) with yet another priamel (76-80):[161]

αὐτίκα χαλκῆας μὲν ὑδείομεν Ἡφαίστοιο,
τευχηστὰς δ' Ἄρηος, ἐπακτῆρας δὲ Χιτώνης
Ἀρτέμιδος, Φοίβου δὲ λύρης εὖ εἰδότας οἴμους·
ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες, ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων
θειότερον· τῷ καί σφε τεὴν ἐκρίναο λάξιν.

This priamel ends with the ringing climax ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες (79), which he immediately glosses with a restatement of his previous point: that Zeus' kings are most divine and that is why he chose them (79-80).

Then begins yet another priamel, in summary form, which leads ultimately to the point of this whole section: that Ptolemy is Zeus' favored ruler (84-86):

ἐν δὲ ῥυηφενίην ἔβαλές σφισιν, ἐν δ' ἅλις ὄλβον·
πᾶσι μέν, *οὐ μάλα δ' ἶσον. ἔοικε δὲ* τεκμήρασθαι
ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι· *περιπρὸ* γὰρ *εὐρὺ* βέβηκεν.

Zeus gives all (πᾶσι, 85) kings wealth, but certainly not in equal degree (οὐ μάλα δ' ἶσον, 85). And this is proven by our ruler

---

τίς; (= οὐδείς) is sufficient, but Callimachus goes on to explain it (93): οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' ἀείσει; Cf. Lucr. 5.1-6.

[161] For αὐτίκα as a motive for a priamel, cf. *Iamb.* 12.58-68.

(ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι, 86), who is far the best. The thought behind this is: "all kings are in your favor, but none is more favored than ours." Then follows praise of Ptolemy's Zeus-like swiftness of action (87-88)—the climax of this section of the hymn. Then Callimachus contrasts other kings who are much less efficient, some of whose plans Zeus himself totally frustrates (89-90).[162] The effect of this contrast is to open the mind to the wide range of earthly failure so that the achievement of Ptolemy can shine even more impressively. Furthermore, Zeus is reintroduced in his traditional role of dispensing good and evil, thereby neatly effecting a transition to the *envoi* (91-96).

To recapitulate, the final lines of the body of the hymn (70-88) display a subtle interweaving of three priamels by means of which Ptolemy will eventually be singled out as the greatest king and praised for his efficiency. They are: 1) Zeus' selection of kings over all human classes (70-75); 2) a recapitulating priamel (cf. αὐτίκα, 76) with the progression: smiths-Hephaestus, warriors-Ares, hunters-Artemis, Apollo-musicians, and climactically Zeus-kings (76-79); and 3) a summary priamel on the unequal lot of kings, culminating in Ptolemy's superiority (84-88).

The first two priamels exemplify the way in which Callimachus is at pains to justify the climax of a priamel by adding explanations. After the climax of the priamel in lines 70-73: σὺ δ' ἐξέλεο πτολιάρχους (73), he goes on to prove the superiority of rulers (cf. εἵλεο δ' αἰζηῶν ὅ τι φέρτατον, 70) by listing subordinates (farmers, warriors, sailors), by declaring that *everything* is subordinate (ὧν πάντα, 75), and finally by stating the same thing with a rhetorical question: τί δ' οὐ (= πάντα) κρατέοντος ὑπ' ἰσχύν; (75). At the end of the following priamel (76-79), two explanatory clauses are added (ἐπεί, 79; and τῷ, 80) which reiterate the point of the priamel. In both cases the force of the climax is considerably attenuated by the additional (and somewhat bathetic) commentary. It is as if the grand self-confidence of the earlier poets (Homer, Homeric hymns, Pindar) had been lost, and Callimachus felt compelled to justify himself at each turn, even to the point of belaboring the obvious.

---

[162] Menander the Rhetor recommends comparing the *laudandus*' reign with previous ones, and without disparaging them, still giving the present one perfect marks (*Rh. Gr.* 3.376-377). That is the topic behind this comparison with other (unspecified) kings. F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 109 quotes Menander with regard to Theoc. 17.104-105, but it hardly seems appropriate there.

At *h. Apol.* 69-71, Callimachus, while on the subject of Apollo "city-founder," employs a priamel to link Apollo's cult-epithet with Cyrene:

> ὤπολλον, *πολλοί* σε Βοηδρόμιον καλέουσι,
> *πολλοὶ* δὲ Κλάριον, *πάντη* δέ τοι οὔνομα *πουλύ*·
> *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Καρνεῖον*· ἐμοὶ πατρώιον οὕτω.

Of note here is the summary *πάντη* δέ τοι οὔνομα *πουλύ* (70) before the climax: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Καρνεῖον (71).[163] Then, as we have noted before, he adds a justification to the climax: ἐμοὶ πατρώιον οὕτω (71), which is—strictly speaking—not necessary, and quite unlike the economy of the earlier poets. In the following lines (72-76) he traces the history of the cult from Sparta through Thera to (climactically) Cyrene. Here historical sequence (cf. πρώτιστον, 72; δεύτερον, 73; and τρίτατον, 73) and the priamel-form merge.[164]

It is, however, in his *Hymn to Delos* that Callimachus most relies on the Homeric model, for much of the hymn is a reworking of the Delian part of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*.[165] In the first 27 lines of the hymn there is a studied adaptation of the priamel-form, such as we saw in *h. Zeus* 70-88. The entire section consists of amplification of Delos as the theme of his song, and the priamel is integral to this purpose. The hymn begins with the rhapsodic question: "When

---

[163] F. Williams, *Callimachus, Hymn to Apollo* (Oxford 1978) 66 rightly notes: "the *Priamel* heightens the effect of Καρνεῖον, which is delayed until the end of the sentence." He also comments: "as often, Call. sets himself apart from the many." This conventional passage is hardly evidence for that. He seems to be uncertain as to the meaning of αὐτάρ (p. 67). Here it is clearly the adversative particle introducing the climax of a priamel (= ἐγὼ δέ or ἀλλ' ἐγώ). Cf. *h. Hom.* 2.429 and Moschus 2.69 (and above, notes 35, 36). For another hymnal priamel which culminates in the preferred name of the god, cf. Isidorus *h.* 1.14-24 [in V. F. Vanderlip, *The Four Greek Hymns of Isidorus and the Cult of Isis*, *American Studies in Papyrology* Vol. 12 (Toronto 1972) 17].

[164] Cf. also the numerical priamel at *h. Art.* 119-122, which opens with a rhapsodic question:

> *ποσσάκι* δ' ἀργυρέοιο, θεή, πειρήσαο τόξου;
> πρῶτον ἐπὶ πτελέην, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἧκας ἐπὶ δρῦν,
> τὸ τρίτον αὖτ' ἐπὶ θῆρα. τὸ τέτρατον *οὐκέτ'* ἐπὶ δὴν
> *ἀλλά* μιν εἰς ἀδίκων ἔβαλες *πόλιν*, οἵ τε περὶ σφέας...

The climactic arrangement of subject matter: trees, animals, city (withheld for effect) is obvious in spite of textual difficulties in lines 121 f. Note οὐκέτι (121) in the climax (cf. *h. Del.* 273: καὶ ἔσσομαι οὐκέτι πλαγκτή). The following relative clause elaborates on what is clearly the subject of interest in this priamel.

[165] Most apparent is the adaptation of the journey of Leto, to which Callimachus adds the characteristically Hellenistic touch of the episode of Cos (160-190).

will you sing of Delos, the nurse of Apollo?" This is purely rhetorical, for with the very question is the announcement of his theme. But at the end of line 2, Callimachus steps back, and by means of a priamel provides a context for his theme, which he can reintroduce in line 9 (νῦν, 9 answers πότ', 1). The entire section is quite complicated (1-10):

Τὴν ἱερήν, ὦ θυμέ, τίνα χρόνον ἢ πότ' ἀείσεις
Δῆλον, Ἀπόλλωνος κουροτρόφον; ἦ μὲν *ἅπασαι*
Κυκλάδες, αἳ νήσων ἱερώταται εἰν ἁλὶ κεῖνται,
εὔυμνοι· Δῆλος δ' ἐθέλει *τὰ πρῶτα* φέρεσθαι
ἐκ Μουσέων, ὅτι Φοῖβον ἀοιδάων μεδέοντα
λοῦσέ τε καὶ σπείρωσε καὶ ὡς θεὸν ἤνεσε *πρώτη*.
ὡς Μοῦσαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃ μὴ Πίμπλειαν ἀείσῃ
ἔχθουσιν, τὼς Φοῖβος ὅτις Δήλοιο λάθηται.
Δήλῳ νῦν οἴμης ἀποδάσσομαι, ὡς ἂν Ἀπόλλων
Κύνθιος αἰνήσῃ με φίλης ἀλέγοντα τιθήνης.

Note the summary ἅπασαι (2) and the εὔυμνοι (4), derived from *h. Hom.* 3.19, 207. *All* the Cyclades are worthy of *abundant* song, but (δ', 4) Delos is *foremost* (τὰ πρῶτα) when it come to the Muses. Again Callimachus adds a justification with the explanatory ὅτι-clause (5-6), and further reinforces it in the following two lines (7-8). It is only in line 9 (climactic νῦν) that the poet can truly begin to sing of Delos, but even here he adds "*so that* Apollo may applaud my taking thought of his dear nurse."[166] Of special interest is the way in which Callimachus has integrated the priamel into the structure of the verse by means of enjambement (especially in lines 2-3), quite unlike the bolder lines of the Homeric hymns.

In the following lines (11-24), Callimachus contrasts the barren island of Delos with the great islands of Corsica, Euboea, Sardinia, and Cyprus, who in spite of their greatness follow in her train. These islands are then contrasted *as a group* (κεῖναι, 23) with Delos, for their strength lies in fortifications, whereas Delos relies on Apollo. The following lines (24-26) expatiate on the preference of the latter, in the manner characteristic of Callimachus.

There are two other priamels in this hymn worthy of brief mention. To conclude her speech (266-273), Delos boasts that no other land will be as beloved by any god, as she will be by Apollo, and expands this into a priamel (271-273):

---

[166] Note the subtle variation by which Δῆλον Ἀπόλλωνος κουροτρόφον (2) becomes Δήλῳ ... Ἀπόλλων ... τιθήνης (9-10) at the end of this introduction.

οὐ Κερχνὶς χρείοντι Ποσειδάωνι Λεχαίῳ,
οὐ πάγος Ἑρμείῃ Κυλλήνιος, οὐ Διὶ Κρήτη,
ὡς ἐγὼ Ἀπόλλωνι· καὶ ἔσσομαι οὐκέτι πλαγκτή.

This priamel was used to lend force to Delos' boast; three lines later Callimachus uses another priamel to introduce the concluding section of the hymn (276-279):

οὐδέ σ' Ἐνυώ
οὐδ' Ἀΐδης οὐδ' ἵπποι ἐπιστείβουσιν Ἄρηος·
ἀλλά τοι ἀμφιετεῖς δεκατηφόροι αἰὲν ἀπαρχαί
πέμπονται...

This leads into the impressive list of ἀπαρχαί which are brought to Delos from all over the world.[167]

2. *Theocritus*

The Theocritean corpus contains many priamels. A number of them in the pastoral tradition naturally draw upon rustic material as foil, in order to lend verisimilitude to the setting. Theoc. 10.30-31 is typical:[168]

---

[167] Call. *Aet.* 3.75.44-49, where the poet affirms that Acontius would not, in exchange for that night with Cydippe, have accepted the speed of Iphicles or the wealth of Midas, is considered a priamel by Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) 44-46 and Krischer (*Intro.*, n. 18) 84. But the climax (νυκτὸς ἐκείνης, 44) *precedes* the foil. Although it contains material commonly found in priamels, it is formally not one. Cf. *Intro.*, n. 50. At *Aet.* 2.43.12-17, there is a priamel which has gone unnoticed:

καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰ μὲν ὅσσα καρήατι τῆμος ἔδωκα
ξανθὰ σὺν εὐόδμοις ἁβρὰ λίπη στεφάνοις,
ἄπνοα πάντ' ἐγένοντο παρὰ χρέος, ὅσσα τ' ὀδόντων
ἔνδοθι νείαιράν τ' εἰς ἀχάριστον ἔδυ,
καὶ τῶν οὐδὲν ἔμεινεν ἐς αὔριον· *ὅσσα δ' ἀκουαῖς*
εἰσεθέμην, *ἔτι μοι μοῦνα πάρεστι τάδε.*

Although the context is missing, the point of the priamel is clear. Note the subtle way in which Callimachus has integrated the priamel into the elegiac couplets, especially the way in which the climax occurs at the end of the hexameter and is enjambed.

[168] For other examples, cf. [Theoc.] 8.57-59, 79-80, 9.7.8, 31-35, and Theoc. 11.10-11. Particularly charming is [Theoc.] 8.53-56:

μή μοι γᾶν Πέλοπος, μή μοι Κροίσεια τάλαντα
εἴη ἔχειν, μηδὲ πρόσθε θέειν ἀνέμων·
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τᾷ πέτρᾳ τᾷδ' ᾄσομαι ἀγκὰς ἔχων τυ
σύννομα μῆλ' ἐσορῶν Σικελικάν τ' ἐς ἅλα.

And in pastoral prose, cf. the priamel at Longus 1.14: *πόσοι* βάτοι με *πολλάκις* ἤμυξαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔκλαυσα· *πόσαι* μέλιτται κέντρα ἐνῆκαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔκραγον. *τουτὶ δὲ* τὸ νύττον μου τὴν καρδίαν *πάντων ἐκείνων πικρότερον.*

ἁ αἶξ τὰν κύτισον, ὁ λύκος τὰν αἶγα διώκει,
ἁ γέρανος τὤροτρον· *ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ τὶν μεμάνημαι.*

The opening of Theoc. 12 contains a priamel of six lines (3-8), in which the speaker expresses the *extent* of his joy at the return of his lover. Six examples are prefaced by ὅσσον (with skillful variation of position and content), and lead up to the climax: τόσσον εὔφρηνας (8).[169] This formula will be repeated many times in the Latin tradition as *tantum* ... *quantum.*

Another extensive priamel occurs at [Theoc.] 20.34-42. Here the point of the priamel is the discrepancy between the examples and the climax. After listing the gods who have fallen in love with rustics (Aphrodite, Selene, Rhea, and climactically Zeus: note the shift to the second person), the poet presents the exception (42):

Εὐνίκα δὲ μόνα τὸν βουκόλον οὐκ ἐφίλασεν.

Priamels of this type (cf. Pet. *Sat.* 83.10.5: *sola*) usually have a satiric or sarcastic edge to them.[170]

There is one summary priamel of note.[171] In the important *Id.* 7, Simichidas prefaces his song with the following (91-94):

Λυκίδα φίλε, *πολλὰ* μὲν *ἄλλα*
Νύμφαι κἠμὲ δίδαξαν ἀν' ὤρεα βουκολέοντα
ἐσθλά, τά που καὶ Ζηνὸς ἐπὶ θρόνον ἄγαγε φάμα·
ἀλλὰ τόγ' ἐκ πάντων μέγ' ὑπείροχον, ᾧ τυ γεραίρειν
ἀρξεῦμ'· ἀλλ' ὑπάκουσον, ἐπεὶ φίλος ἔπλεο Μοίσαις.

This introductory priamel, which selects one choice item from a multitude of possibilities, goes back at least as far as Homer (cf. *supra* pp. 33-35), and finds frequent expression in the orators. It is a good device for capturing the attention of the audience and amplifying the forthcoming subject. Akin to it is the dramatic feigning of

---

[169] This scheme is much more usual in its negative form (οὐ τόσσον ... ὅσσον = *nec tam* ... *quam*) and goes back to Homer, e.g. *Il.* 6.450-455, 14.315-328, and 394-401. It is obvious why the negative form predominates in priamels. Contrasting foil permits a wider range of possibilities, and the negative gives a greater sense of emphasis through ὑπεροχή, while in the positive form, there is mere parity. For other examples (positive) cf. Theoc. 7.149-153 and 16.60-63, and (negative) [Moschus] 3.37-44.

[170] Cf. Xenoph. 2W and Theogn. 183-188. In this example from the Theocritean corpus, there is a pun on the word μόνα, which at 42 means "only." It is used in its sense of "alone" at 45: μώνα δ' ἀνὰ νύκτα καθεύδοι, with obvious satirical intent.

[171] But cf. also 17.77-79, which initiates a sequence eventually to culminate in Ptolemy (85).

ἀπορία when facing a large subject and not knowing where to begin. Such is the stance at 17.11-13:

τί πρῶτον καταλέξω; ἐπεὶ πάρα μυρία εἰπεῖν
οἷσι θεοὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐτίμησαν βασιλήων.
'Ἐκ πατέρων οἷος μὲν ἔην τελέσαι μέγα ἔργον...

This form is descended from such passages as *h. Hom.* 3.19-27 and 207-220, where quantity is indicated in summary form, as here (cf. μυρία, 11), or sometimes in a list of possibilities. In this case the poet answers his question by plunging directly into his subject (note the asyndeton): ἐκ πατέρων οἷος... (13).[172]

In the "Epithalamium of Helen" there are two priamels (26-28 and 29-31) which consist of multiple comparisons with the climax: ὧδε καὶ ... Ἑλένα. And at Theoc. 17.53-57 Ptolemy and Berenice cap a list of famous mothers and warrior sons (Diomedes, Achilles).[173]

Also in the corpus are two priamels which emphasize the brevity of human life. The first, at [Theoc.] 23.28-32, is a simple inductive priamel, in which several examples of beauty that fades are listed to persuade the youth that his beauty, too, will not last. More interesting is the priamel in Moschus' "Lament for Bion," 99-105. At first the poet contrasts mallows, celery, and anise, which perish and return the next year, with ἄμμες δ' (102). He then lists examples: οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρτεροί, οἱ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες (102), which are then completed with the specific example: καὶ σὺ μὲν ὤν (105) (Latin = *tu quoque*).[174]

3. *Other Hellenistic Authors*

There are no noteworthy priamels in Apollonius Rhodius,[175] and none in Herondas.[176] Timocreon 1D begins with a priamel and

---

[172] On οἷος in climaxes, cf. above, note 6.

[173] H. Fränkel (*Intro.* n. 4) 95 n. 2 points out: "Eine feine Huldigung, diskret versteckt, liegt hier in der Wahl der Beispiele: Achilleus (das Themisorakel) und Diomedes (Δ 405) sind noch grösser als ihre grossen Väter."

[174] Cf. the much briefer rendition of the same basic form at Cat. 5.4-7: *soles* ... *nobis* ... *(tu) da.*

[175] Cf. A. R. 1.1340-1342, an imitation of *Il.* 22.159-161. It is interesting that this adaptation exhibits the same features of integration and enjambement that we noted in Callimachus' verse. Cf. *supra*, pp. 99, 103, 104 n. 167.

[176] It should be noted that at 1.26-32, Gyllis ends her list of Egyptian attractions with γυναῖκες (32), a sly hint that Mandris finds them most attractive of all, especially since it follows the summary in line 31 and is enjambed.

Phoenix of Colophon's choliambic poem "Ninos" (*fr.* 1.3-9, Powell) uses a priamel to heighten the humor of Ninos' particular excellence: he was not A, B, C, or D, ἀλλ' ἦν ἄριστος ἐσθίειν τε καὶ πίνειν / κἠρᾶν (9-10).[177]

There are no noteworthy priamels in the known plays of Menander,[178] but there are three fragments which contain priamels. We have already discussed *fr.* 656 (*supra* pp. 18-23). *Fr.* 539 begins with a summary: if he wishes, a man can, with great effort, achieve anything (πᾶν, 2). This is then expanded by the examples of wealth, wisdom, and health. But there is one exception (πλὴν ἕν τι, 5): he cannot escape grief, for he will have cares even in prosperity.[179] *Fr.* 540 K, which consists of advice to a young man, states the general proposition that all (πᾶν, 3) corruption is internal. This is expanded by the examples (cf. οἷον, 4) of rust, moths, and wormwood. Unfortunately, the climax is not correctly preserved. The MSS. give ὁ δέ (6), which is very awkward, and the emendation of Dobree σὲ δέ (accepted by Kock and Sandbach) seems incorrect because the following two lines are too general to apply to one individual. What is obvious is that φθόνος is the point of the priamel, and without the rest of the context we have no way of knowing what particular point was made to the young man.[180]

---

[177] On this priamel, cf. Kröhling (*Intro.*, n. 8) 52-53.

[178] Cf. *fr.* 223 Kock (from the Θεοφορουμένη), probably from the beginning of a monologue, where the speaker would prefer to be anything (several animals are listed) than a man.

[179] This fragment is preserved at Stob. 98.19 (περὶ τοῦ βίου ὅτι βραχύς, κτλ.) where Semonides 1W and Mimnermus 2W are also found. Once again, the self-contained form of the priamel helps to account for its survival. Cf. the much briefer summary priamel on the same subject in *fr.* 668 Kock, preserved at Stob. 99.18 (περὶ λύπης, κτλ.): *πολλῶν* φύσει τοῖς *πᾶσιν* ἀνθρώποις κακῶν / ὄντων *μέγιστόν* ἐστιν ἡ *λύπη* κακόν.

[180] This fragment is preserved at Stob. 38.29 (περὶ φθόνου). For a prosaic adaptation of the same material, cf. Polyb. 6.10.3-4. Among priamels preserved in other Middle and New comic playwrights are the speech of the κόλαξ in Antiphanes' *Lemnian Women* (K. ii 70 = Athen. 6.258D), in which he praises the τέχνη of flattery above all other vocations, and the witty priamel of the parasite on the attractions of a rich man's house in Diphilus' *Parasite* (K. ii 561 = Athen. 6.236B). Cf. the summary priamel of Baton (at Stob. 6.29) and the opening of the cook's speech in Hegesippus' *Brothers* (K. ii 312 = Athen. 7.290B), where Syrus, fearing further elaboration, impatiently asks him to get to the point. Finally, there is the long priamel on the degeneration of music in Pherecrates' *Cheiron* (?) (K. i 188 = Plut. *de mus.* 1141D), discussed *supra*, p. 86.

4. *The Anacreontea*

Many of the little poems in the collection are built on priamels, and in most of them the preference of the poet for ἔρως and οἶνος is contrasted with other possibilities. Typical is the opening of *Anacr.* 8:[181]

οὔ μοι μέλει τὰ Γύγεω
τοῦ Σάρδεων ἄνακτος·
οὔθ' αἱρέει με χρυσός,
οὔτε φθονῶ τυράννοις.
ἐμοὶ μέλει...

There are also literary overtones in several of these priamels (making them types of *recusationes*). For example, in *Anacr.* 9, the poet contrasts the madness of wine (which he desires), with the destructive madness of Alcmeon, Orestes, Heracles, and Ajax (= tragic and epic themes?). *Anacr.* 23 is more specific. When he attempted to sing of the Atreidae, the Seven against Thebes, and the labors of Heracles, his lyre responded only with love; so he bids farewell to the heroes (11) (= epic themes), for his lyre *only* (4, 12) (superlative in climax) sings of love. In *Anacr.* 26, the poet makes explicit the *recusatio* implicit in Sappho *fr.* 16:

Σὺ μὲν λέγεις τὰ Θήβης,
ὁ δ' αὐ Φρυγῶν ἀϋτάς,
ἐγὼ δ' ἐμὰς ἁλώσεις.
οὐχ ἵππος ὤλεσέν με,
οὐ πεζός, οὐχὶ νῆες,
στρατὸς δὲ καινὸς ἄλλος
ἀπ' ὀμμάτων με βάλλων.

Note the witty change of persons in the first three lines: you, he, but I, and how the possessive proper names Θήβης and Φρυγῶν contrast with the possessive pronoun ἐμάς. These distant (and grand) themes are rejected for the close and the personal. And by playing on the ambiguity of erotic and martial vocabulary, he then contrasts Sappho's cavalry, infantry, and navy (= epic themes) with the "unconventional" warfare of love which has laid him low.[182]

---

[181] Throughout I use the numbering in J. M. Edmond's *Greek Lyric and Iambus II* (London 1931).

[182] Cf. the priamel of Strato at *A.P.* 12.2 (a programmatic poem for his collection), where the contrast is between tragic and epic πένθεα (2) and his delightful poetry (ἱλαραῖς Χαρίτεσσι, 5). For a succession of three priamels in one poem, cf. *Anacr.* 29 (1-3, 5-7, and 10-14).

Anacr. 21 is an "inductive" priamel, an exhortation to his comrades to let him drink. After listing the things in nature which drink (1-5), the poet caps them with the rhetorical question (τί; 6 = μή), which delays the climax to the next line (7):[183]

καὐτῷ θέλοντι πίνειν;[184]

And finally, there is the little priamel of *Anacr.* 27: horses have a brand on their flanks, one can recognize Parthians by their tiaras, but I (ἐγὼ δέ, 5) know lovers as soon as I see them, for they have a slight mark in their soul.[185]

E. EPIGRAMS

Definitions of the Medieval German priamel frequently speculate that it was originally an "epigramatic improvisation," for its very form is consonant with the epigram. Its ability to sketch a large context by means of representative parts, and to give force to its "point," gives it a kind of concision which is typical of so many epigrams. Furthermore, the flexibility of the priamel for expansion and contraction makes it easily adaptable to statements of two to ten lines. No attempt will be made here to preserve a historical perspective, nor yet to include every single priamel in the *Greek Anthology*. Only types will be dealt with.

Personal προαίρεσις, stated negatively (οὐκ ἐθέλω, μισῶ, οὐ στέργω, μὴ ζήτει, and the like) and then capped by one's true choice, is a common epigrammatic type, and good examples are *A.P.* 9.110, 11.58, 12.2, and 15.12. Of a similar nature, but with a witty turn in the climax,[186] is Callimachus *Ep.* 28 (= *A.P.* 12.43).

Another form which occurs in almost all forms of poetry is the list of *impossibilia* (ἀδύνατα),[187] either stated positively, as in the epitaph

---

[183] Cf. *Anacr.* 24.8-9 for another rhetorical question (τί οὔ;) which delays and emphasizes the climax.

[184] Note the inductive καί. For another, cf. Meleager's epigram at *A.P.* 9.363.

[185] Cf. *Priap.* 36. This theme of recognition forms the basis of a priamel of François Villon "Je congnois bien mouches en let..." whose climax is: "Je congnois *tout* fors que *moy mesmes.*"

[186] Note the summary πάντα (4) before the climactic Λυσανίη, σὺ δέ (5). But the ἀλλά (5) reverses the procedure and includes Lysanias' "uncommon" beauty among τὰ δημόσια (4).

[187] Cf. *Intro.* pp. 28-29.

on Midas' tomb (*Cert.* 265-270 = Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 135-140)[188] or in the fragment attributed to Critias at Athen. 13.600E, or negatively in the form "sooner A, B, etc. than X," as in *A.P.* 11.227 and 9.575.

Some epigrams have ironic or satirical twists. One is Lucilius' scathing epigram on Telesilla (*A.P.* 11.239, note the ὑπεροχή in the verb νικᾶν, 5).[189] Another is Meleager at *A.P.* 12.94. There is a humorous twist to Antipater of Thessalonika's epigram (*A.P.* 11.31), whose list of φοβερά is capped with μύθων μνήμονας ὑδροπότας (4). There is also humor in the famous oracle to the Megarians (or Aegians), when in answer to the question τίνες κρείττους εἰσὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων; it responded with a priamel which culminates in the Argives. Then, a rider is added, which is, as it were, a priamel in reverse (*A.P.* 14.73.7-8):

ὑμεῖς δ', ὦ Μεγαρεῖς, οὐδὲ τρίτοι, οὐδὲ τέταρτοι,
οὐδὲ δυωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ, οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ.

But elsewhere priamels can be used in epigrams to point up the glory of a fire on a winter's day (*Ep. Hom.* XIII), two satisfied lovers (*A.P.* 5.169), the hardness of a girl's heart (*A.P.* 5.246), a victorious charioteer (*A.P.* 16.357, 337), a new subject of pastoral song (*A.P.* 12.128), or the temple of Artemis as the greatest among the wonders of the world (*A.P.* 9.58).[190] And finally, one of the most delightful is the "inductive" priamel of Meleager (*A.P.* 9.363) which describes the wonderful activity of spring and culminates in the line (23):

πῶς οὐ χρὴ *καὶ* ἀοιδὸν ἐν εἴαρι καλὸν ἀεῖσαι;[191]

---

[188] Cf. Plato *Phdr.* 264d and *A.P.* 7.153, which omit lines 3-4, showing how flexible the foil of a priamel is for expansion or contraction.

[189] Cf. the much more elaborate priamel on the same subject in Anaxilas' *Chicken* (Kock ii 270 = Athen. 13.558A).

[190] Later to be surpassed by the Flavian Colosseum; cf. Mart. *lib. spect.* 1.

[191] There may be a tendency for rhetorical questions to precede the subject in the climax in Hellenistic poetry. Cf. also *Anacr.* 21 and 24. Cf. the opening of Chaucer's *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales*, where the list of springtime events leads to pilgrimages in general, then to pilgrimages to Canterbury, and then to the pilgrim of the poem. This is a marvelous example of a "focusing" priamel.

F. GREEK PROSE

Although it is more diffuse than its poetic prototypes, the opening of Herodotus' *Histories* (1-5) is in the form of a priamel along the lines of *h. Hom.* 1.1-6 and Sappho *fr.* 16: οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δὲ ... ἐγὼ δέ, where the opinions of others are presented, only to be rejected *en masse* by the new approach offered by the writer. While the author of the Homeric Hymn is searching for the birthplace of Dionysus and Sappho is seeking τὸ κάλλιστον, Herodotus is trying to establish the true starting-point (ἀρχή), the αἰτία of the conflict between East and West. First he presents the opinions of the Persians (1-4), and then, more briefly, the contradictory ideas of the Phoenicians (5). What is important to notice is that Herodotus has no intention of taking seriously these claims, and he has purposely made such rationalistic speculation about the real motives behind the "myths" of Io, Europe, Medea, and Helen appear ridiculous, but instead (like Sappho) shifts the discussion to a new level.[192] This is his summary and climax (5.3):

> *ταῦτα* μέν νυν Πέρσαι τε καὶ Φοίνικες λέγουσι· *ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ* μὲν *τούτων* οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτω ἢ ἄλλως κως *ταῦτα ἐγένετο, τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτὸς πρῶτον...*

He refuses to deal with such speculation (ταῦτα, τούτων),[193] but instead makes as the point of departure for his entire *Histories* the man *whom he himself knows first* to have wronged the Greeks, and who is dramatically named (in asyndeton) at the beginning of section 6: Κροῖσος ἦν Λυδός.... The form Sappho had used to exalt her love for Anactoria Herodotus uses to begin his histories with that which *he himself* knows.

Summary priamels, wherein a great amount of material sketched by means of such words as πολλά or πάντα and then one item is

---

[192] It is not too much of an exaggeration to say that this shift is from mythological speculation (μῦθος) to empirical observation (ἱστορίη). R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Harvard 1973) 88-89 notes the element of parody in Herodotus' treatment of the Persian and Phoenician *mythoi*. "In fact, I 1-5 is not so much an investigation of the causes of the wars as a parody of previous treatments of the subject. ... Herodotus is not merely illustrating the banality of the legends; he is also reminding the reader how sterile was the attempt to distill truth from legends."

[193] For other examples of rejection of foil (generally referred to as ταῦτα) before the climax, cf. Eur. *fr.* 659 and Plato *Lysis* 211e. Cf. also Shakespeare, *Sonnet* 91.7 "these" (quoted above, note 52) and Prop. 2.5.25 (*haec*).

singled out for comment, abound in Greek prose. Typical is Dem. *de Cor.* 291:[194]

> πολλὰ τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἄλλα κατηγορηκότος αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεψευσμένου, *μάλιστ' ἐθαύμασα πάντων*, ὅτε...

There are several more elaborate examples in the epideictic speeches of Isocrates, where the orator is consciously adapting poetic techniques to his oratory. At the opening of the *Panathenaicus*, he lists the types of literary studies in which he did not engage as a youth: mythology, history, and forensic speeches, so as to highlight his choice: richly ornamented advisory speeches of pan-Hellenic scope.[195] At *Evag.* 4, as a climax to the contrast between the material splendor of the funeral games and his eulogy, Isocrates uses a priamel which culminates in the power of oratory to immortalize ἀρετή for all men. At *ad Dem.* 6-7, he uses a priamel to show that beauty, wealth, and strength are flawed, but that ἀρετή is the most lasting and important possession.

Another priamel occurs in Isocrates' letter of recommendation for his student Diodotus (*Ep.* 4.2-3). Although he has had many (πολλῶν, 2) students from all over the world (παντοδαπῶν, 2), οὗτος δ' οὕτως εὐάρμοστον τὴν φύσιν ἔσχηκεν ὥστ' ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς εἰρημένοις τελειότατος εἶναι (3).

Two Platonic priamels have already been discussed: at *Lysis* 211d-e ("one man wants horses, another dogs, another money, another distinctions, but I want friends")[196] and at *Laws* 660e-661b (a reordering of Tyrtaeus' ἀρεταί),[197] but there are others in epideictic passages. At *Symp.* 221c-d, Alcibiades resorts to a priamel to emphasize the incomparability of the Socratic achievement: in the case

---

[194] Other examples include Dem. 18.5, 60.25, 61.27, Isoc. *Paneg.* 61, 114 (with a list), *Arch.* 42, Plato *Symp.* 221c, *Menex.* 241a, and *Tim.* 24d. E. Fraenkel, "Eine Anfangsformel attischer Reden," *Glotta* 39 (1961) 1-5 gives many examples of speeches in oratory and drama which begin with a form of πολύς. Of the examples which he cites, the following are summary priamels: Thuc. 3.37.1, Soph. *Trach.* 153-154, *Phil.* 1047-1048, Aristoph. *Thesmo.* 830-831, *Av.* 860-861, Lysias 3.1, Dem. 23.82 and 24.34, Men. *Peric.* 276 ff., and Plaut. *Capt.* 998 ff. He mentions that the earliest example is Aesch. *Pers.* 176-180, but clearly the form goes back to the Homeric examples discussed *supra* pp. 33-35.

[195] Note the variation in the list, which has become so long that a summary rejection is necessary: ἀλλα *πάντας τούτους ἐάσας* (2). Cf. above, note 193. Cf. also *Antid.* 45-46, and Dem. 18.129-130 (ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐάσω, 130).

[196] Cf. above, note 109.

[197] Cf. above, note 60.

of Achilles, one can compare others such as Brasidas; in the case of Pericles, men like Nestor and Antenor; likewise in the case of others; *but this man* has no such likeness.[198] In Socrates' first speech at *Phdr.* 240a9-b7, he uses a priamel to claim that the lover is worse than a flatterer or a prostitute. And the famous description of Diotima (*Symp.* 211c) of the ascent to beauty itself is a priamel (or, more precisely, a κλῖμαξ), wherein each of the previous items in the list serves as foil for the final term, which is knowledge of beauty itself.

Finally, there is the humorous parody of a priamel at *Gorg.* 448c, where the budding rhetorician Polus answers Chaerephon's question as to what τέχνη Gorgias possesses by saying: ὦ Χαιρεφῶν, *πολλαὶ* τέχναι ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰσὶν... ἑκάστων δὲ τούτων μεταλαμβάνουσιν *ἄλλοι ἄλλων ἄλλως*, τῶν δὲ ἀρίστων οἱ ἄριστοι· *ὧν καὶ Γοργίας* ἐστὶν ὅδε, καὶ μετέχει τῆς *καλλίστης* τῶν τεχνῶν. The priamel-form is used to single out Gorgias' τέχνη from all others, and to cap them all by declaring it the best, but he has not bothered to give it or the foil terms any concrete existence, so that the result is a rhetorical skeleton.[199]

---

[198] On the attempt to find an εἰκών as a motive for a priamel, cf. Menander *fr.* 656 (and *Intro.*, pp. 18-21).

[199] Other examples in Greek prose include Hdt. 8.144.1 [discussed by Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) 46-48], Thuc. 1.86.3 [discussed by Schmid (*Intro.* n. 13) 62-63], and the passages noted by Nisbet and Hubbard (*Intro.*, n. 19) 2, 92, 95: Dio Chrys. 44.6, Liban. *decl.* 30.31, and Greg. Nyss. *Ep.* 20.2 ff. I have not included in this study material from the *Septuagint* or from the *New Testament*. It has received considerable attention in Schmid's work, and it is far enough removed from the formal consistency of the classical priamel to warrant its absence here. Although the often discussed passage from I *Corinth.* 13.1-13 bears a remote resemblance to a priamel, there are many excellent examples in the Hebrew, of which I might single out *Jer.* 9.23-24 (= 22-23 BH): "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, let not the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him who glories glory in this, that he understands and knows me. ..." I am indebted for this example to James G. Smeal. But perhaps the most impressive priamel in the *Old Testament* is the opening of the "Hymn to Wisdom" at *Job* 28.1-12. Here the motive for the priamel is the ζήτησις (cf. חוֹקֵר, 3) for precious things (silver, gold, iron, copper, lapis lazuli), and the extent of man's effort to secure them. Out of this impressive list emerges the true subject of interest, which in contrast to all the other precious things (note the summary at 10: כָּל־יְקָר), is not to be "found" (תִּמָּצֵא, 12) in the earth. The prominent וְהַחָכְמָה (12) marks the climax with the waw-adversative (= ἡ *δὲ* σοφία, LXX). The evaluative motif is reserved for later in the hymn, where wisdom is praised above gold, silver, etc. (15-19). For a brief discussion, cf. F. Dornseiff, "Die altorientalische Priamel," in Kröhling (*Intro.*, n. 8) 75-78 [= *Antike und alter Orient*[2] (Leipzig 1959) 379-382].

PART II: LATIN POETRY

A. PLAUTUS

I can find no examples of priamels in what remains of early Latin.[1] Beginning, however, with Plautus, we do find some in accordance with the theatrical convention that the monologue of an entering character begin with a generalized or hyperbolic statement, which is then specified with the particular case at hand. We have already dealt with two examples from Greek drama, Eur. *Alc.* 747-750 and Men. *fr.* 656 Koerte.[2] There are many such speeches in Plautus.[3] Some of them are in the form of a priamel and create a comic bathos by comparing heroic instances with the present case. An example is the opening of *Pers.* 1-5:

> Qui amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias
> superavit aerumnis suis aerumnas Herculi.
> nam cum leone, cum excetra, cum cervo, cum apro Aetolico,
> cum avibus Stymphalicis, cum Antaeo *deluctari mavelim*
> *quam cum Amore.*

Similar bathos is found in *Most.* 775-777, where Tranio puts himself in the same league with Alexander and Agathocles, or in *Cas.* 759-762, where the festivity inside surpasses that of the Nemean and Olympian games, or in *Pers.* 778-779, where Dordalus claims to be far and away the most miserable of all who are, have been, or will be. At *Capt.* 461-463 the parasite Ergasilus creates a priamel with the structure: *miser* ... *miserior* ... *miserrimus* (naturally he is in the last category), and at *Capt.* 998 Tyndarus emphasizes the misery of his punishment by saying that he has seen many pictures (*multa saepe picta*) of infernal punishments, but nothing so bad as the stone quarries. Finally, at *Mil.* 1284-1291, Pleusicles enters

---

[1] Kröhling (*Intro.*, n. 8) 46-49 attempts to discover the earliest Latin priamel in the proem of Cato's *De Agri Cultura*, but there are considerable problems with the text, and the actual form is not that close to the classical priamel.

[2] Cf. *supra* pp. 18-23 and 98.

[3] E.g. *Men.* 446-448, *Ps.* 415-417, 905-907, *Pers.* 470-471, *Rud.* 593-596, 1281-1282, *Stich.* 274-275, *Tri.* 1115-1116, *Truc.* 699-700, the parasite quoted at Macr. *Sat.* 3.16.1, and Ter. *Hec.* 198-204, 281-282, *And.* 254-259, 855-859. Cf. also Menander *Dys.* 666-669. On this phenomenon, cf. E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, F. Munari, trans., (Florence 1960) 157-172, 421-424.

with a conventional priamel, which even includes a comparison with Achilles (in *praeteritio*), but he cuts it short when he sees that he is not alone. As in the case of Middle and New Comedy, priamels occur in Roman comedy in the set speeches of a character (especially when entering the scene), and not in dialogue, where a verisimilar colloquial style is maintained.

B. CATULLUS

There are several minor priamels of note in Catullus, and they are used for quite distinct purposes. One of them occurs in C. 7 to Lesbia, which opens with a question:[4]

> *quaeris*, quot mihi basiationes
> tuae, Lesbia, sint satis superque.

This is then answered with two ἀδύνατα (cf. C. 61.199-203 for the same items):

> 3 quam magnus numerus ...
> 7 aut quam ... multa ...
> 9 *tam te* basia multa ...

The climax is neatly prepared for in line 8: *furtivos hominum vident amores*, and the entire poem owes much of its grace to its artful simplicity.[5]

C. 11.1-16 can be considered a geographical priamel, for the opening list of distant places where Catullus' friends are willing to accompany him is patent foil for the true "mission" on which he means to send them.

> *Omnia haec*, quaecumque feret voluntas
> caelitum, temptare simul parati,
> pauca *nuntiate* meae puellae
> *non bona dicta.*

Note the summary in lines 13-14 (such summaries are especially common after long lists), which signals the transition to the real

---

[4] A question frequently provides the impetus for a priamel, since it poses in summary form a number of alternatives and presupposes a specific answer. Cf. πῶς; at *h. Hom.* 3.19 and 207, τίνι; at Pindar I. 7.1, τίνα at O. 2.1 (with *quem*? at Hor. C. 1.12.1) and *quid*? at Hor. C. 1.31.1. For other priamels beginning with questions of the "*quaeris*" type cf. *Priap.* 11 and 61 (Buecheler).

[5] Cf. the different effect of the imitation at Mart. 6.34.

subject of the poem, marked by the imperative *nuntiate* (15), with the *non bona dicta* withheld for effect.[6]

Two other priamels are used for humorous amplification. The first is C. 26:

> Furi, villula nostra non ad Austri
> flatus opposita est neque ad Favoni
> nec saevi Boreae aut Apheliotae,
> *verum* ad milia quindecim et ducentos.
> o ventum horribilem atque pestilentem!

Here the list of winds is foil for a different kind of "wind." The other is 58a, whose relationship to poem 55 is doubtful, and may have become detached from its original context because of the self-contained form of the priamel. It is a witty exaggeration of a form as old as Homer (cf. οὐδ' εἴ μοι ... ἀποδοῖτε ... οὐδέ κεν ὥς, *Od.* 22.61-63 and *Il.* 9.379-386), and there is a suggestion of a summary (*quos iunctos, v.l. vinctos*, 7) before the cap, introduced by *defessus tamen* (8), with the delayed *quaeritando* (10).[7]

C. LUCRETIUS

In the epideictic passages of *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius sometimes employs a priamel to give special emphasis to his subject. For example, in his critique of earlier philosophers in *Book* I, he comes to Empedocles (whom he consistently treats with respect second only to Epicurus) at 1.716, but rather than proceed with his critique, he pauses to list the outstanding attributes of Sicily (717-725), which culminate in the θαῦμα of Mt. Aetna's eruptions. He then sums up those marvelous attributes in order to provide a sharper contrast to Empedocles (726-730):

> quae cum magna modis *multis* miranda videtur
> gentibus humanis regio visendaque fertur,

---

[6] Cf. the geographical expansion (foil for Tibur) at Hor. C. 2.6.1-4 and at Prop. 1.6.1-4 (foil for staying with Cynthia).

[7] K. Quinn, *Catullus The Poems* (London 1970) 261 says succinctly of lines 8-10: "The climax, apparently, for which all that precedes prepares." The contention of H. Comfort, "Parody in Catullus LVIIIa," *AJPh* 56 (1935) 45-49 that Catullus is here parodying the "high-flying manner of the self-conscious *vates*" demonstrates how far one can go astray by analyzing mere content to the complete neglect of form.

rebus opima bonis, *multa* munita virum vi,
nil tamen hoc habuisse viro *praeclarius* in se
nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur.

Note that the last category (*multa munita virum vi*, 728) smooths the transition to *hoc* ... *viro* (729). Put more succinctly, this summary priamel is similar in form to that of Sophocles' *Ant.* 332: "Many are the wonders (*multis modis miranda*, 726), but (*tamen*, 729), none (*nil*, 729) is more wonderful (*praeclarius*, 729, *nec* ... *magis* ... *mirum*, 730) than man (*hoc* ... *viro*, 729).[8] The rhetorical purpose of this digression in praise of Sicily and Empedocles is to make a clean break from the criticism of Heraclitus, and to prepare the reader for the extended and important refutation of Empedocles.

A companion priamel opens the praise of Epicurus at the beginning of *Book* VI (6.1-5):

Primae frugiparos fetus mortalibus aegris
dididerunt quondam praeclaro nomine Athenae
et recreaverunt vitam legesque rogarunt,
et primae dederunt solacia dulcia vitae,
cum genuere virum tali cum corde repertum...

Here Athens is praised for first producing grain, for its festivals and artistic creations, and for its laws. Although there is no adversative in line 4, the repeated *primae* tends to put what follows on an equal footing with the "old-time" (*quondam*, 2) discoveries. In other words, whereas Empedocles proved to be the most important marvel of Sicily, Epicurus is the last in the line of Athenian boons to mankind. Empedocles *contrasts* with Sicily's other marvels; Epicurus *completes* Athens' *solacia dulcia vitae* (4).

In his great consolatory speech at 3.1024-1052, Lucretius caps the list of great men who have died (kings, generals, philosophers, poets) with the greatest of them all, Epicurus (1042-1044):

ipse Epicurus obit decurso lumine vitae,
qui genus humanum ingenio superavit et omnis
restinxit, stellas exortus ut aetherius sol.

[8] Cf. Claud. *carm. min.* 17.43-44 (Platnauer) for a summary priamel of much shorter form in which Sicily's greatest claim to fame is the birth of Amphinomos and Anapius, the two pious brothers of Catina.

plura licet summae dederit Trinacria laudi,
noverit *hoc maius* se genuisse *nihil.*

to make the contrast the more striking when he applies his *argumentum a fortiori* to the reader: *tu vero* ... (1045).

But the best-known, and deservedly famous, priamel in Lucretius is the one which opens Book II (1-10):

Suave, mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis,
e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem;
non quia vexari quemquamst iucunda voluptas,
sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere suave est.
suave etiam belli certamina magna tueri
per campos instructa tua sine parte pericli.
sed nil dulcius est bene *quam* munita tenere
edita doctrina sapientum templa serena,
despicere unde queas alios passimque videre
errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae...

Much of the force of this passage consists of the fusion of the priamel form with the simile.[9] On one level, Lucretius is saying that Epicurean withdrawal from the turmoil of life is 1) like watching a foundering ship, or 2) like watching a battle, or 3) like having the security of a lofty citadel. There is a consistency of imagery and thought throughout the similes (e.g. *spectare*, 2; *tueri*, 5; *despicere*, 9; *laborem*, 2; *certamina*, 5; *pericli*, 6; *certare*, 11; *labore*, 12), but at the same time he has imposed the form of the priamel: *suave* ... *suave etiam* ... *sed nil dulcius est* (1-7), so that the examples, the imagery, and the vocabulary culminate in the climactic and beautiful lines of 7 ff., where the merely *physical* withdrawal of the first two examples is capped by the *spiritual* withdrawal of the *doctrina* (8).[10]

---

[9] In this respect, it is one of the few equals to the opening of Pindar O. 1.

[10] A comparison of Eur. *Bacch.* 902-911, a passage of striking similarity in many respects, where no attempt is made to maintain parallelism of imagery and thought, will reveal how Lucretius has combined the *pathos* of the simile with the *logic* of the priamel to create a remarkably moving passage.

εὐδαίμων μὲν ὃς ἐκ θαλάσσας
ἔφυγε χεῖμα, λιμένα δ' ἔκιχεν·
εὐδαίμων δ' ὃς ὕπερθε μόχθων
ἐγένεθ'· ἑτέρᾳ δ' ἕτερος ἕτερον
ὄλβῳ καὶ δυνάμει παρῆλθεν.
μυρίαι δ' ἔτι μυρίοις
εἰσὶν ἐλπίδες· αἳ μὲν
τελευτῶσιν ἐν ὄλβῳ
βροτοῖς, αἳ δ' ἀπέβησαν·
τὸ δὲ κατ' ἦμαρ ὅτῳ βίοτος
εὐδαίμων, μακαρίζω.

D. AUGUSTAN POETRY

1. *Vergil*

At [Vergil] *Culex* 26-36 occurs a *recusatio* in priamel form, where the poet rejects a list of possible themes of song (all grand-style battles), followed by the choice of the poet: *tibi namque canit non pagina bellum* (26) ... *nec* (29) ... *non* (30) ... *non* (31) ... *nec* (31) ... *non* (33):

> *mollia sed tenui* pede currere carmina... (35)

In his *laus Messallae* (*Catal.* 9.39-40), the poet uses a summary priamel to provide a transition from Messalla's poetic achievements and introduce his martial exploits, a frequent use of the priamel in encomia:

> *multa* neque immeritis donavit [*sc.* Roma] praemia alumnis,
> praemia Messallis *maxima* Publicolis.

The priamels in the *Eclogues*, like those in Theocritus (cf. *supra* p. 104) employ rustic comparisons as foil (e.g. *Ecl.* 3.80-81, 82-83, 5.32-34, and 7.61-68). In one example, he goes one step further and combines the priamel with *gradatio* (*Ecl.* 2.63-65) (cf. Theoc. 10.30-31):

> torva leaena lupum sequitur, lupus ipse capellam,
> florentem cytisum sequitur lasciva capella,
> *te Corydon*, o Alexi...

The importance of the foil in determining the relative mood and gravity of the climax is well illustrated in the following two examples, in which Vergil uses the same form and the same conclusion, but the first is in the lighter, pastoral vein, while the latter is in epic style.[11]

> dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis amabit,
> dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae,
> semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.
> (*Ecl.* 5.76-78)

On the form of the priamel, cf. E. R. Dodds *ad loc.* For a very long modern adaptation of this passage (which culminates in "first and passionate love"), cf. Byron, *Don Juan* I 122-127.

[11] A similar statement can, of course, be cast in negative form as at *Ecl.* 1.59-63 (*ante* A, B, C, D, E, *quam*...): cf. Claud. *PO* 169-173 and [Seneca] at *A.L.* I i, p. 331 n. 440. For a discussion of asseveration and ἀδύνατα, cf. *Intro.*, pp. 28-29.

in freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbrae
lustrabunt convexa, polus dum sidera pascet,
semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt...
(*Aeneid* 1.607-609)

At the end of the second *Georgic* (475-502), Vergil contrasts the type of poetry and life of the (Epicurean) philosopher (*felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*, 490) with his own poetry and the life of the farmer (*fortunatus et ille*, *deos qui novit agrestes*, 493). At lines 503 ff. he begins a priamel, sketching the various (pre)occupations of men (*alii*, 503 ... *hic*, 505 ... *alius*, 507 ... *hic*, 508 ... *hunc*, 508), all of which are carefully chosen to contrast with the life of the farmer (513):

agricola incurvo terram dimovit aratro...

The prominent *agricola* (in contrast to *alii*, *hic*, etc.) marks the climax, and an adversative particle is not necessary because the rustic life has been under discussion since lines 475 ff. Furthermore, the word itself has also been carefully avoided by periphrases in the preceding lines so that it has a climactic effect here.

Georgic 2.109-176 is a long and very complex passage, which consists of several priamels and lists in order, ultimately, to single out for praise Italy and Caesar. The entire passage begins with a summary statement (109):

Nec vero terrae ferre *omnes omnia* possunt...

This is then demonstrated by a long catalogue (110-135) of the various regions which produce various trees. This list is then converted to foil for the primacy of Italy (136-138):

Sed neque Medorum silvae, ditissima terra
nec pulcher Ganges atque auro turbidus Hermus
laudibus Italiae certent ...

Now that the priamel has arrived at the praise of Italy (*laudibus Italiae*, 138), the poet duly introduces Italy's glories with a priamel, contrasting the monstrous "crop" sown by Jason with Italy's produce (140-144):

haec loca non tauri spirantes naribus ignem
invertere satis immanis dentibus hydri
nec galeis densisque virum seges horruit hastis,
sed gravidae fruges et Bacchi Massicus umor
implevere...

The long list which follows (144-166) culminates in the particular "crop" (cf. *extulit*, 169) which has made Italy the most famous and which has made her superior to all lands of the earth: her men (167-172):

> haec genus acre virum, Marsos pubemque Sabellam
> adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volscosque verutos
> extulit, haec Decios, Marios magnosque Camillos,
> Scipiadas duros bello *et te*, *maxime* Caesar,
> qui *nunc* extremis Asiae *iam* victor in oris
> imbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum.

The last ringing lines of this priamel (170-172), which culminate temporally (*nunc*, *iam*, 171), qualitatively (*maxime*, 170), and personally (*te*, 170) with Augustus, mark the end of this magnificent "Hymn to Italy," which is then duly concluded with the hymnal χαῖρε (173-174):

> *salve*, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
> magna virum...

Vergil's *Aeneid*, like Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* and non-Homeric epic in general, has very few priamels. In fact, there is only one of real note, but it is one of the most memorable passages in the entire epic,[12] and one of the best-known passages in Latin, where Anchises contrasts the Greek achievements with the special mission of Rome (*Aen*. 6.847-853):

> excudent alii spirantia mollius aera,
> (credo equidem), vivos ducent de marmore voltus;
> orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus
> describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent:
> *tu regere* imperio populos, *Romane*, *memento*
> (*hae* tibi erunt artes) pacique imponere morem,
> parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

The prominent *tu* (851) followed by the imperative *regere memento*, gives by contrast the "*artes*" in which Rome is to excel, and there is more than a hint of a superlative in *regere*, the "master" art.

---

[12] R. G. Austin, *Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford 1977) 260-261 notes the priamel and says: "This epilogue to Anchises' prophecy is the most famous sustained passage in the whole *Aeneid*." At *Aen*. 7.54-56, Vergil uses a summary priamel to introduce Turnus (note *multi*, 54; *tota*, 54; *pulcherrimus*, 55; and the delayed name Turnus, 56).

2. *Horace*

Next to Pindar's choral lyrics, Horace's *Odes* exhibit the most sophisticated use of priamels. Indeed, the poem which opens the collection of *Odes* consists of an elaborate priamel neatly included within a dedicatory address to Maecenas. The first two verses constitute the formal introduction of a hymn (vocative, epithets), and the last two suggest the request (35-36):

> quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres
> sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

What comes in between is an "occupational" priamel, a list of (pre)occupations: athlete, politician, farmer, peasant, sailor, merchant, indolent/hedonist, soldier, and hunter, each characterized in a phrase or two. Although a detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this study, it is important to note that Horace in each instance suggests by choice of word a flaw or limitation in each chosen endeavor. In that respect, the priamel also functions as a "*recusatio*" in which other aims are "rejected" or "refused" in favor of the poet's choice (29-32):

> *me doctarum* hederae praemia frontium
> dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
> nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
> secernunt populo...

The prominent *me* (29), which signals the climax of this list, is frequent in Horace as a way of contrasting the impersonal (*sunt quos*, 3 ... *hunc*, 7 ... *illum*, 9, etc.) with the personal, the distant with the near, the general with the particular, and formally parallels Sappho fr. 16.1-4: οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δὲ ... οἱ δὲ ... ἐγὼ δέ.

As is usual in such climaxes, important words are thrust forward for contrast, and the word following *me* (*doctarum*, 29) is one of the keys to understanding the poem, for it is precisely this element of "wisdom" which separates Horace's poetic aspiration from that of the athlete (3-6) in spite of their similar goals (athlete: *evehit ad deos*, 6; poet: *dis miscent superis*, 30), and which contrasts with the purely hedonistic life portrayed in 19-22.[13] The repeated *me* (30) then fur-

[13] Although Horace elsewhere praises "*carpe diem*" as a corrective for far-reaching ambition, here it approaches indolence and *contrasts* (as the form of the priamel demands) with the nobler aspirations of immortality achieved through intellectual and artistic effort suggested in lines 30-36. For other discussions of this famous priamel, cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 230-232 and H. Musurillo,

ther specifies the "remoteness" (*me gelidum nemus ... secernunt populo*, 30-32) of his chosen field, and fulfills the function of a superlative. In the same way that Sappho singles out the theme of love in *fr.* 16, Horace here singles out the vocation of poet.

Horace also employs a modified form of the priamel in hymnal invocations containing a *dubitatio*, where the list of possibilities finally concludes with the object of choice. This practice, which descends from the rhapsodic hymns through the lyric hymns and encomia of Pindar, is readily adapted by Horace. In C. 1.12, for example, Horace openly imitates the opening of *Olympian* 2:

> Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
> tibia sumis celebrare, Clio?
> quem deum?

In the following lines of the poem, Horace provides lists of gods (Jupiter, Minerva, Liber, Diana, Apollo), heroes (Hercules, Castor and Pollux), and Roman heroes (Romulus through Julius Caesar). But all of this culminates, in the last three stanzas, with the partnership of Jupiter and Augustus in the maintenance of order in the divine and human realms.

Likewise, in C. 1.2.25 ff., Horace deliberates as to which god to summon in these dire times: *quem vocet divum populus ruentis / imperi rebus?* (25-26). Then follows a tentative list (Vesta, Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, Mars), which culminates in Mercury, who, in a fashion like C. 1.12, is identified with Augustus.

At the beginning of *Epis.* 2.1, Horace climaxes a list of deified mortals (Romulus, Liber, Castor and Pollux, and Hercules) with Augustus. The first two words signal the cap: *praesenti tibi* (15), and the superlative praise of line 17 (*nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale fatentes*) completes the tribute. In C. 3.11.13-32, Horace deftly uses lists to work his way to the real subject of interest: the example of the Danaids. He begins by listing the δυνάμεις of Mercury (over wild animals and rivers and Cerberus), which leads to those in Hades (Ixion, Tityos), and climactically to the Danaids. At that point, Horace can tell their story as a warning to Lyde. The preceding lists are obvious foil.

"Horace, *Odes* 1.1," TAPA 93 (1962) 233-237. Pindar, *fr.* 221Sn., a priamel which is frequently compared to the Horatian passage, is, unfortunately, incomplete.

In contrast to the long, serious occupational priamel of C. 1.1, there are several instances in Horace of brief, humorous characterizations of the poetic occupation. Here the priamels are used to give emphasis by means of contrast. Typical is *Serm.* 2.1.24-28:

> quid faciam? saltat Milonius, ut semel icto
> accessit fervor capiti numerusque lucernis;
> Castor gaudet equis, ovo prognatus eodem
> pugnis; quot capitum vivunt, totidem studiorum
> milia: *me pedibus delectat claudere verba...*

Note the summary (27-28: *milia* = μυρία in the Greek tradition) before the climax, introduced as usual by *me.*[14]

There are several instances when Horace employs a priamel in order to give emphasis to his subject. At *Serm.* 1.9.31-33 he recites the "oracle" of the Sabine crone:

> "hunc neque dira venena nec hosticus auferet ensis
> nec laterum dolor aut tussis nec tarda podagra:
> *garrulus hunc* quando consumet cumque..."

At *A.P.* 63-69, in order to emphasize the fact that language usage is subject to change, Horace introduces it with a priamel of three *mortalia facta* (68)—engineering feats on the grand scale—which are then used as examples to prove *a fortiori* (cf. *nedum*, 69) that "much less" will diction fail to change. Note the prominence of *sermonum* (69), which singles out the new category. C. O. Brink calls this an "excursus," and rightly so, for a priamel is in fact a kind of excursus, a digression, which eventually returns to its subject. Brink goes on to note:[15] "his point seems to be simply to give poetic 'body' to the idea that language is as prone to change as other creations of man." That is to ignore the emphatic *nedum* (69), which supplies the logical connection and makes this priamel into a enthymeme: if A, B, and C perish, then *a fortiori* so must speech. Other examples of emphatic priamels include *Epis.* 1.8.4-7 (note the emphatic *mente*, 7), and of a similar structure (*non* ... *non* ... *sed*) *Serm.* 1.6.58-60 and C. 1.16.5-9, where *irae* (9) are singled out from a list of things which disturb the mind. At C. 1.28.15-22, a survey of deaths in

---

[14] Similar are *Epis.* 2.1.114-117, *Serm.* 2.1.47-59, *A.P.* 379-382, and 453-455.

[15] C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry, The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge 1971) 151.

war, on the sea, of young and old (note summary motif) leads to the *me quoque* (21), the subject of the poem.[16]

Horace also uses groups of examples with a didactic purpose (*argumentum e similibus*) in order to exhort someone to a certain behavior.[17] At *Epis.* 1.2.64-68 he lists two examples from training young animals in order to exhort the *puer* Lollius to pay heed to his words:

> fingit equum tenera docilem cervice magister
> ire, viam qua monstret eques; venaticus, ex quo
> tempore cervinam pellem latravit in aula,
> militat in silvis catulus. *nunc adbibe* puro
> pectore verba, puer, *nunc te* melioribus offer.

This form of παραίνεσις, which uses examples from nature,[18] becomes a mannerism in the elegiac poets, especially when they assume the didactic pose of a *magister amoris.*

C. 2.9 (*Non semper imbres nubibus hispidos*) contains two priamels, which serve complementary functions. The scholia describe the poem as *paranetice consolatio*, and each priamel fulfills one of these purposes. The first two stanzas (1-8) give examples of how the weather is constantly changing. This is then contrasted with the behavior of Valgius: *tu semper urges flebilibus modis / Mysten....* Contrary to the constant variety of nature, Valgius *always* sings erotic laments. The didactic intention is clear: Valgius ought to change, too. But before he states the moral, Horace employs another priamel (13-17) whose purpose is consolatory, and lists two examples of bereaved relatives (Nestor, Priam and Hecuba and their daughters) who ceased lamenting the loss of their sons. These examples from nature and from the human realm can now be brought to bear on the issue at hand, with an injunction (*desine mollium / tandem querellarum*, 17-18) to change his tune.[19] And as a nice added touch, Horace suggests that Valgius join him (*cantemus* 19) in celebrating the feats of Augustus. This switch from personal

---

[16] The form of the priamel argues strongly against dividing this ode before *me quoque* (21), as in many editions. On the editorial practice of separating the climax of a priamel from its foil (especially when the foil is lengthy), cf. below, note 44.

[17] Cf. *supra* p. 38 n. 15.

[18] This procedure of using examples from animal nature goes back at least to the sophists. Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Sophists* (Cambridge 1971) 104.

[19] Implied throughout this paraenesis is the *argumentum a fortiori.* Cf. C. 1.7.15-21.

sorrow (elegiac poetry) to public victory (encomiastic poetry) will provide the true consolation.[20]

There are two summary priamels in Horace. One is at C. 1.36.5-7. At C. 1.24.9-10, he employs a summary priamel to introduce Vergil's grief at the death of Quintilius:[21]

multis ille bonis *flebilis* occidit,
nulli flebilior quam tibi, *Vergili.*

If Horace shows any real innovation in the use of the priamel, he does so in his very skillful "geographical" lists. C. 1.7 begins as a "*recusatio,*" in which he delegates to others the praise of various cities (Rhodes, Mytilene, Ephesus, Corinth, Thebes, Delphi, Tempe, Athens, Argos, Mycenae) and then caps the list (10-12):

me nec tam patiens Lacedaemon
nec tam Larisae percussit campus opimae,
quam domus Albuneae resonantis...

The *me* (10) introduces the poet's own choice, and as a neat variation, he includes two additional cities, Lacedaemon and Larisa, before stating his προαίρεσις Tibur. There are several things achieved in this priamel. First of all, there is the contrast between the anonymous *alii* (1), *quibus* (5), and *plurimus* (8) and the personal *me* (10), such as in C. 1.1. Also, by being preferred to such great cities of the world, the status of Tibur is considerably enhanced.[22] Furthermore, it is to be noticed that all the cities named are Greek, which, coupled with the first word of the poem *laudabunt*, indicates that the general context is the Greek epideictic tradition of "praise

---

[20] For another argument from analogy (on a very different subject, with humorous but didactic intent) cf. *Serm.* 1.2.114-119.

[21] Note the concentration of many of the elements associated with priamels. 1) general category: *flebilis occidit*; 2) quantity: *multis*; 3) capping particle: here adversative asyndeton (most translations must supply a "but" and in the parallel at C. 1.36.5-7 *tamen* appears); 4) an indication of relative merit: *nulli flebilior* (note the normal litotes), and 5) the subject of ultimate interest: *tibi, Vergili* (note the switch to second person, and the climactically withheld vocative).

[22] Although he does not say specifically that he prefers Tibur to Rhodes, Mytilene, etc., the implication is clear when he "refuses" to sing of them (*laudabunt alii*). For Krischer's analysis of this passage, cf. *Intro.*, n. 22. It is important to note, especially when trying to arrive at the logical form of this passage, that Horace does *not* say that Tibur is better than the others; he merely says that he *prefers* it and gives his reasons why. In terms of logic, this priamel is no different from Sappho *fr.* 16.1-4. Both poets state their preferences, and it is up to the reader to judge the justice of their claim. Cf. also Hor. *Epis.* 1.7.44-45.

of cities."[23] That tradition now culminates in a *Latin* poem to *Roman* Tibur. Last, there is the prominent *domus* (12), which from the analogy of other Horatian "geographical" priamels, has special importance. Although it undoubtedly does refer to the cave of the Sibyl (as numerous parallels show),[24] nevertheless, it is not a randomly chosen word, and in contrast to the "far-away" Greek cities, *domus* has the effect of stressing the particular quality which Horace prizes in his favorite place: it is "home," the local, the near, the dear.[25]

Another example of a geographical priamel is the beginning of C. 2.6. Septimius can go with the poet to far distant places (Gades, the Cantabrians, the Syrtes),[26] but in contrast, Tibur (prominent position) is the preference of the poet. Then Horace proceeds to go beyond the priamel, which has already selected his favorite spot: he elaborates on his second choice, *ille terrarum ... angulus* (13-14), Tarentum, which beckons the two friends. Again the near, the familiar, the small is contrasted with the distant, the exotic, the wild.

C. 2.18 opens with a priamel of the form *non ... non ... at* (1-9), in which the splendor of foreign wealth is contrasted with the adornment of the poet's home (*mea ... in domo*, 2). There is no marble from Hymettus or from Africa; no Attalid palace, no Laconian purple, but *fides* (9) and a rich spirit (though poor in material goods). This contrast between external (and geographically distant) wealth and the poet's domestic spiritual qualities echoes many other such contexts.[27]

At the beginning of C. 4.3, the subject is renown (*clarabit*, 4), and the various ways in which it is to be gained. He whom Melpomene favors shall win no Isthmian boxing matches, shall not be a victor in an Achaean chariot, nor be crowned with Delian chaplets, but (10-12):

---

[23] Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (*Intro.*, n. 19) 92, and *Horace: Odes II* (Oxford 1978) 95-96.

[24] *Ibid.*, 100-101.

[25] On the contrast between *alienum* and *proprium* in Horace, especially as expressed in geographical terms, cf. "*Odes* 1.20: An Horatian *Recusatio*," CSCA 11 (1978) 194 n. 13.

[26] On the relationship of this priamel to Catullus 11, cf. *supra* pp. 115-116.

[27] Cf. S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace* (Bloomington 1962) 331-335.

sed quae *Tibur* aquae fertile praefluunt
et spissae nemorum comae
fingent Aeolio carmine nobilem.

As at C. 1.7.1-14, Horace has enriched the priamel by contrasting not only *ways* of acquiring glory (athletics and war = the active life), but also the *geographical provenance* of the glory, whose origin is Greek (*Isthmius*, 3; *Achaico*, 5; *Deliis*, 6). And just as this Greek recognition of achievement is "displayed at the Capitol" (*ostendet Capitolio*, 9), meaning that the active life flourishes in Rome as well, so it is Tibur (10) which is prominent in the climax, indicating by contrast the "quieter" domain of Horatian lyric, which prefers the "remoteness" of Tibur's groves (*nemorum*, 11) rather than the public realm, and claims its descent from the more personal Aeolian lyric (*Aeolio carmine*, 12) rather than the grand, choral lyric suggested in the opening lines. The complex and beautiful priamel, while acknowledging the poet's reliance on certain aspects of the Greek tradition, also contrasts Greece with Rome (cf. the prominent *Romae*, 13), the active life with the contemplative, grand-style lyric with personal lyric, and deed (*labor*, 3) with song (*carmine*, 12). Finally, the issue of the entire passage (*clarabit*, 4) is neatly completed with the long-delayed *nobilem* (12).

Of a similar nature is the priamel in C. 1.31, which begins with a hymnal *dubitatio* (1-3):[28]

Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem
vates? quid orat de patera novum
fundens liquorem?

Instead of answering the question directly, the poet expands the background by listing what he will *not* pray for, so that his eventual prayer in the last stanza (17-20) will have more force, so that the range of possibilities within which his ethical choice is exercised will be clear, so that the reader will understand just what is sacrificed when the choice is made. Such is a special virtue of the priamel. The poet asks not for (1) Sardinian grain, (2) Calabrian herds, (3) Indian gold and ivory, or (4) fields along the Liris. This first part of the priamel consists of four valuable assets all characterized geographically and introduced by *non*. In the next stanza (line 9),

---

[28] Cf. above, note 4. V. Pöschl, "Das Gebet des Horaz an den Palatinischen Apoll (*c.* 1,31)," GB 4 (1975) 208 notes the use of the priamel in this ode.

for *variatio*, Horace switches to permissive subjunctives (*premant*, 9; *exsiccet*, 11), and characterizes instead two occupations: (1) the Calenian grape-growers, and (2) the merchant rich with Syrian trade. This last example is carefully elaborated (not without a note of depreciative humor in *exsiccet*, 11; *culillis*, 11; *quippe*, 13; and *impune*, 15), so as better to contrast with the poet's choice. It is to be noted that the priamel has laid out not only various kinds of material wealth and abundance (and the means of acquiring them), but also has stressed geographical *distance*, the last mentioned being the merchant's annual visits to the *aequor Atlanticum* (14).

The cap is introduced by the prominent *me* (15), and the rich foods and wines of distant places are undercut by the prominent verb *pascunt* (15) "nourish"—indicating that food is the *means* of existence, not the end-all, as for the merchant. The poet's fare is humble, as is his prayer to enjoy what is at hand (*frui paratis*, 17), as opposed to the "distant" foods. And last, but emphatically, the poet contrasts the material splendor of the foil of the priamel with his own desire for the mind (*mente*, 19) and song (*cithara*, 20).[29] The priamel form has allowed the poet to make a great many points with considerable delicacy and economy.

3. *Tibullus*

The Tibullan corpus contains a number of priamels, but in contrast to Horatian usage, they are more often than not mere rhetorical expansion, and lack the subtlety and power of Horace and Vergil. Indeed, with Tibullus begins a tendency (not just confined to priamels) to prefer witty elaboration to serious, intellectual persuasion. To a certain degree the rigidity of the elegiac couplet tends to regularize each statement into discreet blocks, and this may have encouraged the Roman elegiac poets to produce so many stereotyped priamels. A review of the originality and variety of the Greek elegiac poets (Tyrtaeus, Xenophanes, Theognis) shows that it need not have been. At any rate, with Tibullus begins the production of detachable rhetorical set-pieces, which find continual—and often tedious—use in the poems of Propertius and Ovid.

[29] The force of *senectam* at 19 is "until the day I die." Cf. D. C. Young, *Pindar Isthmian* 7, *Myth and Exempla*, *Mnem. Suppl.* 15 (Leiden 1971) 12-13. Kiessling-Heinze, *Oden und Epoden*[5] (Berlin 1908) 145 well describe the effect of the priamel: "von diesem reich ausgearbeiteten Hintergrund ... die ideale Gesinnung des Dichters sich stark abhebe." They then go on to quote the priamel at Pindar N. 8.37-39.

Like Horace, Tibullus opens his collection of poems with a priamel which contrasts the preferences of others with his own choice. But instead of an elaborate survey, Tibullus simply rejects (note the permissive subjunctives) a life of wealth (*divitias*, 1) and military adventure (3-4) for his own ideal:

> Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro
> et teneat culti iugera multa soli,
> quem labor adsiduus vicino terreat hoste,
> Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent:
> *me mea paupertas* vita traducat inerti...

Although *alius* (1) is singular, it is generalized (ἄλλος τις, "someone else," "other men") and provides the foil for the poet's own aspiration: *me mea paupertas* (5). Unlike Horace's *Ode* 1.1. where the entire poem consists of a priamel, Tibullus merely begins his elegy with a brief priamel, which is then elaborated at great length: lines 7-40 describe his rustic life; 41-52 inveigh against *divitias* (41); 53-56 relegate to Messalla *bella*, while 57-74 describe his love-life with Delia; finally 75-78 reaffirm his refusal of war and wealth. The entire poem is a rhetorical ἐργασία on the values of the modest country life over the wealth and glory of a military career, a contrast which becomes commonplace in Propertius (e.g. 3.4 and 3.5) and in Ovid's *Amores* (e.g. 1.1 and 1.9). Noticeable also in this priamel is the tendency to enclose a complete thought in each line of the couplet, so that the pentameter merely expands the thought expressed in the hexameter. In the above example, lines 2 and 4 could be deleted without appreciable alteration of the sense.

[Tibullus] 3.3, which to all appearances is an imitation in the Tibullan manner, shows how the τόπος "not wealth but love" can be milked for all it is worth. The poem consists, essentially, of three priamels (3-8, 11-23, and 29-32), and they show, by contrast, how much more competent and interesting Tibullus 1.1 is. By way of example, the first of the priamels is quoted below (3-8):

> non ut marmorei prodirem e limine tecti,
> insignis clara conspicuusque domo,
> aut ut multa mei renovarent iugera tauri
> et magnas messes terra benigna daret,
> *sed tecum* ut longae sociarem gaudia vitae
> inque tuo caderet nostra senecta sinu...

Here there is simply no advance in thought in the pentameters; the

economy and richness of Horace's priamels are lost to formal mannerism.

But the priamel can also be used for mere expansion in the genuine poems of Tibullus. Tibullus 1.9.1-6 keeps us in suspense as to what "crime" Marathus has committed, and in order to introduce it with full effect, Tibullus employs a priamel in lines 7-11:[30]

lucra petens habili tauros adiungit aratro
  et durum terrae rusticus urget opus;
lucra petituras freta per parentia ventis
  ducunt instabiles sidera certa rates.
muneribus meus est captus puer...

Another, even more elaborate, priamel is at Tib. 2.3.35-48:

ferrea non venerem sed praedam saecula laudant:
  praeda tamen multis est operata malis.
praeda feras acies cinxit discordibus armis;
  hinc cruor, hinc caedes mors propiorque venit.
praeda vago iussit geminare pericula ponto,
  bellica cum dubiis rostra dedit ratibus.
praedator cupit immensos obsidere campos,
  ut multa innumera iugera pascat ove;
cui lapis externus curae est, urbisque tumultu
  portatur validis mille columna iugis,
claudit et indomitum moles mare, lentus ut intra
  neglegat hibernas piscis adesse minas.
at mihi laeta trahant Samiae convivia testae
  fictaque Cumana lubrica terra rota.

On the whole (and particularly in the climax), the pentameter is mere filler. Although the τόπος of preferring simple furnishings to great wealth is given a great flourish with a wealth of examples, this priamel lacks the power and interest of Horatian priamels on the same subject (e.g. C. 1.31.3-16; 2.16.33-40; 2.18.1-14).[31]

Bypassing other examples in the corpus,[32] we note one further priamel at Tib. 1.8.1 ff.:

[30] Tibullus uses multiple examples to emphasize his points elsewhere in this poem (21-22, 31-34, and 35-36), but they serve as mere amplification and do not introduce a point by analogy or contrast, which is the essence of the priamel. 1.4 is especially rich in such exemplary material (11-14, 16-20, 29-38, 40-52, and 65-66).

[31] Already a tendency begins here which will become more pronounced in later Latin poetry: the foil begins to be valued for its own sake, and the "point" of it tends to be less important.

[32] Schmid (*Intro.*, n. 13) notes 1.1.41-44 and 1.2.67-74. At [Tib.] 3.4.85-94, in order to stress his faith in Neaera, the poet expands in a priamel the τόπος "you

Non ego celari possum, quid nutus amantis
quidve ferant miti lenia verba sono.
nec mihi sunt sortes *nec* conscia fibra deorum,
praecinit eventus *nec* mihi cantus avis:
ipsa Venus magico religatum bracchia nodo
perdocuit multis non sine verberibus.

In order to emphasize his experience of love, the poet contrasts his empirical knowledge with that gained second-hand. Propertius begins a poem in a very similar fashion (2.1.1 ff.):

Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores,
unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber.
non haec Calliope, *non* haec mihi cantat Apollo.
ingenium nobis *ipsa puella* facit.

Although Propertius' priamel contains only two items of foil and is compressed to one couplet, both occur at the same place in their respective poems, both emphasize the climactic term with *ipsa*, and both give authority to the poet's claim to knowledge from direct experience. Cf. also Prop. 1.13.13-14: *haec ego non rumore malo*, *non augure doctus*; / *vidi ego*.

4. *Propertius*

Although there is not a priamel of note in the fourth book,[33] the first three books of elegies contain so many that it is difficult to discuss them in an organized fashion. One reason for the large number of priamels is the expansiveness of Propertius' style. Scarcely a *sententia* is ventured without his giving examples to illustrate it.[34] Many of them simply follow a general statement as an illustrative list, but very often they lead up to the point being made, in which case we consider them to be priamels.

---

were not born from beast, etc." to include six items before insisting on the affability of her parents. At Tib. 2.6.20-28 there is a humorous priamel on *spes*, whose force operates in all situations (farming, fowling, fishing, slaves in chains) including his hopes for an easy conquest of Nemesis. The climax is another instance of an "exception": *sed negat illa* (27). An *argumentum a similibus* in the form of a priamel occurs at *Paneg. Mess.* 8-16, with its climax: *hic quoque* (16). Cf. also 2.4.16-19.

[33] A minor example occurs at 4.4.39-44. Like Ovid's *Fasti* (and *Metamorphoses*), Propertius' last book exhibits a considerable departure of style from his love-elegies, and this is reflected in the few priamels to be found in it.

[34] For example, *nudus Amor formae non amat artificem* (1.2.8) is followed by eight couplets of *exempla; omnia non pariter rerum sunt omnibus apta* (3.9.7) is followed by six couplets before the poet applies it to his own case.

Most of the priamels in Propertius are embedded within poems[35] and their purpose is to highlight a subject which the poet then treats at greater length. For example, in 1.8B, Cynthia has stayed behind, preferring the poet's love to the wealth of Elis and anything that the poet's rival might offer (27-38). Then to switch to himself, he employs a brief priamel (39-40):

> hanc ego *non* auro, *non* Indis flectere conchis,
> *sed* potui blandi carminis obsequio.

He can then exclaim: *sunt igitur Musae* (41) and conclude the poem in exultation at his (poetic) success.

Propertius also employs many two-couplet priamels to emphasize a point, giving two or three items as foil in the first couplet, capping it in the hexameter of the following couplet, and then adding an additional (or qualifying) thought in the pentameter. One example (among many)[36] is 2.13.9-12:

> *non* ego sum formae tantum mirator honestae,
> *nec* si qua illustris femina iactat avos:
> *me iuvet* in gremio doctae legisse puellae,
> auribus et puris scripta probasse mea.

He frequently uses a priamel to emphasize the extent (and/or constancy) of his love. Here are representative examples, beginning with 1.12.15-20:

> felix, qui potuit praesenti flere puellae;
> non nihil aspersis gaudet Amor lacrimis:
> aut si despectus potuit mutare calores,
> sunt quoque translato gaudia servitio.
> *mi* neque amare aliam neque ab hac desistere fas est:
> Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit.

This protestation of constancy (whether modeled on Verg. *Georg.* 2.490 or not) is quite witty in its oxymora: *felix, qui potuit* ... *flere* (15) and *gaudia servitio* (18),[37] and is very elegantly balanced; each pentameter qualifies the hexameters, which carry the burden of the

---

[35] They can, of course, also begin poems, as 1.3.1-8 and 2.14.1-10.

[36] Cf. 1.9.19-22; 1.19.1-4, 13-16; 1.16.29-32; 2.3.5-8; 2.9.33-36; 2.13.5-8; 2.16.51-54; 2.32.49-52; 2.34.15-18; and 3.11.5-8.

[37] Tone is indeed a very difficult quality to gauge, but in view of the wit and ingenuity of these lines, I find it hard to discover "the intensity of emotion it [the poem] conveys" according to L. Richardson, *Propertius Elegies I-IV* (Normon 1977) 179.

form. The prominent *mi* (19) introduces the unique position of the poet, who can neither cease nor transfer his affection.

At 2.15.31-36, the poet employs ἀδύνατα to aver his constancy:[38]

> terra *prius* falso partu deludet arantis,
> et *citius* nigros Sol agitabit equos,
> fluminaque ad caput incipient revocare liquores,
> aridus et sicco gurgite piscis erit,
> *quam possim* nostros alio transferre dolores:
> huius ero vivus, mortuus huius ero.

The form of this passage is very similar to 1.12.15-20 (*felix, qui potuit* ...), quoted above, except that the pentameters here add further examples of a similar nature. Each culminates in the poet's own condition, stated in the first person. The concluding pentameters (rhetorical ἐπιφωνήματα) are also very similar in thought and structure.

There is yet another variation of this theme at 2.25.5-10:

> miles depositis annosus secubat armis,
> grandaevique negant ducere aratra boves,
> putris et in vacua requiescit navis harena,
> et vetus in templo bellica parma vacat:
> *at me* ab amore tuo deducet nulla senectus,
> sive ego Tithonus sive ego Nestor ero.

These three examples attest to Propertius' dexterity in varying the subject matter of priamels, while maintaining the same form and thought.

In answer to Demophoon's (supposed) question as to why the poet is so *mollis in omnis* (13),[39] Propertius replies in a priamel (2.22.15-18):

> cur aliquis sacris laniat sua bracchia cultris
> et Phrygis insanos caeditur ad numeros?
> *uni cuique* dedit vitium natura creato:
> *mi* fortuna aliquid semper amare dedit.

Here, after the specific examples of the first couplet, Propertius

---

[38] For ἀδύνατα on the same theme, cf. 1.15.29-31 and 2.3.5-8. Other variations include 3.19.5-10, 2.30.3-8, and 2.17.5-10.

[39] For questions initiating a priamel, cf. 2.1.1-4 and above, note 4.

sums up the diversity of people's *vitia* before capping them with his own particular "malady."[40]

On the other hand, Cynthia's *inconstancy* is the subject of other priamels. At 1.15.9-22 is a list of virtuous women (Calypso, Hypsipyle, Alphesiboea, and Evadne) who remained true to their departing lovers, contrasted in the climax with Cynthia (23-24):

quarum nulla tuos potuit convertere mores,
  tu quoque uti fieres nobilis historia.

Likewise, at 2.9.3 ff., after an elaborate description of the faithfulness of Penelope and Briseis, the poet sums up the message in order to make the contrast with Cynthia's behavior more striking (17-20):[41]

tunc igitur veris gaudebat Graecia natis,
  tunc etiam felix inter et arma pudor.
at tu non una potuisti nocte vacare,
  impia, non unum sola manere diem!

Propertius also uses priamels to emphasize his art of song.[42] In order to bring around his mistress, Propertius will not employ force (2.5.21-28):

nec tibi periuro scindam de corpore vestis,
  nec mea praeclusas fregerit ira fores,
nec tibi conexos iratus carpere crinis,
  nec duris ausim laedere pollicibus:
rusticus *haec* aliquis tam turpia proelia quaerat,
  cuius non hederae circuiere caput.
scribam igitur, quod non umquam tua deleat aetas,
  'Cynthia, forma potens: Cynthia, verba levis.'

This passage demonstrates how skillfully Propertius can vary the form of the priamel to create special effects. The list of violent acts which he refuses to commit (21-24) are summed up in the hex-

---

[40] Note the climax in the pentameter, which is rare in Propertius. 1.4.5-8 is identical in structure, including the summary (*quascumque*, 7) before the climax in the pentameter:

tu licet Antiopae formam Nycteidos, et tu
  Spartanae referas laudibus Hermionae
et *quascumque* tulit formosi temporis aetas:
  Cynthia non illas nomen habere sinat.

[41] Cf. 2.8.7-12, where, in contrast to everything else (generals and cities are given as examples), *illa tamen numquam ferrea dixit "Amo."*

[42] He also uses a priamel to praise Cynthia's poetic talents at 2.3.9-22.

ameter (25), while the pentameter (26) prepares for the climax: *scribam igitur* (27). The pentameter (28) neatly provides the chastening message.

At 2.13.17 ff., Propertius tells Cynthia the arrangements for his funeral. He first lists (19-23) the costly fare which he refuses, preferring instead just what is appropriate for a plebeian (23-24). Then comes the climax (25-26):

sat mea sat magna est, si tres sint pompa libelli,
  quos ego Persephonae *maxima* dona feram.

Here is the traditional contrast between material poverty and spiritual achievement, and naturally, the greatest (*maxima dona*, 26) offering which he has are his three books of poetry.

At the end of the closing poem of Book II, Propertius caps a list of poets and mistresses (Varro-Leucadia, Catullus-Lesbia, Calvus-Quintilia, and Gallus-Lycoris, 85-92) in the Latin tradition with the hope that he and Cynthia may be included in their number (2.34.93-94):[43]

Cynthia quin *etiam* versu laudata Properti—
  hos inter si me ponere Fama volet.

At 3.9.35-44, in his *recusatio* to Maecenas (note the priamel of the preceding lines 7-22), the poet lists the themes which he will not treat as foil for his love poetry in the manner of Callimachus:

non ego velifera tumidum mare findo carina:
  tota sub exiguo flumine nostra mora est.
non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse paternos

---

[43] For other list priamels in Propertius, cf. 1.15.9-24 (a list of loyal lovers, whose example Cynthia does not follow) and 3.11.61-70 (where a list of Roman military glories is capped by Actium). For a more modern example, cf. Ben Jonson's *Ode* "Helen, did Homer never see..." After 30 lines of poets and their lovers, he concludes:

And shall not I my Celia bring,
Where men may see whom I do sing?
Though I, in working of my song,
Come short of all this learned throng,
Yet sure my tunes will be the best,
So much my subject drowns the rest.

Cf. the brief priamel of Ovid, *Am.* 3.15.7-8, which places him in the Roman poetic tradition:

Mantua Vergilio, gaudet Verona Catullo;
  Paelignae dicar gloria gentis ego...

Cadmi nec septem proelia clade pari;
nec referam Scaeas et Pergama Apollinis arces,
et Danaum decimo vere redisse ratis,
moenia cum Graio Neptunia pressit aratro
victor Palladiae ligneus artis equus.
inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos
et cecinisse modis, †duret† poeta, tuis.

In a similar fashion, in his famous *recusatio* 3.3, Calliope tells him to stick to love poetry and employs a priamel to make her point (41-48):[44]

nil tibi sit rauco praeconia classica cornu
flare, nec Aonium tingere Marte nemus;
aut quibus in campis Mariano proelia signo
stent et Teutonicas Roma refringat opes,
barbarus aut Suevo perfusus sanguine Rhenus
saucia maerenti corpora vectet aqua.
quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantis
nocturnaeque canes ebria signa fugae...

To conclude this survey of priamels in Propertius, we shall treat four poems that are almost entirely constructed of priamels. The first is 1.14, a set-piece whose theme ("love over wealth") is stated in the climax of the opening priamel (1-8):

Tu licet abiectus Tiberina molliter unda
Lesbia Mentoreo vina bibas opere,
et modo tam celeres mireris currere lintres
et modo tam tardas funibus ire ratis;
et nemus omne satas intendat vertice silvas,
urgetur quantis Caucasus arboribus;
non tamen ista meo valeant contendere amori:
nescit Amor magnis cedere divitiis.

Here, as frequently, Propertius uses the pentameter in the climax to bring the entire priamel to a striking conclusion. Next follow two

[44] For a priamel which is a variation of this theme, cf. 2.34.27-32. It is worth noting that H. E. Butler in his Loeb translation begins a new paragraph with the climax of this priamel at lines 47 ff. He does the same at 2.13.25 ff. and 3.2.9 ff. (as does J. M. Edmonds at Solon 13.63 ff.). In these and other places, the form of the priamel is neglected. Instead of thinking in terms of foil and climax, these translators are thinking more in terms of content, and once the subject of interest is introduced (and elaborated), they tend to separate it from the preceding preparation and consider it a new topic in its own right.

blocks of supporting examples introduced by *nam* (9, 15) (= γάρ in the Greek tradition). The first group (9-14) consists of positive *exempla*, the second (15-22) of negative *exempla*, and the whole poem is then capped by the couplet (23-24), which returns to the first person:

> quae *mihi* dum placata aderit, non ulla verebor
> regna vel Alcinoi munera despicere.

In spite of its rather methodical structure, this piece possesses no little charm in its choice of foil, particularly in the opening six verses.

The programmatic poem which opens Book II displays typical Propertian expansiveness by means of priamels, as a detailed analysis shows. The basic theme of this *recusatio* can be summed up as: "I would write encomia of yours and Caesar's deeds, Maecenas, but I am incurably in love." The poem opens with a priamel (2.1.1-4):

> quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores,
> unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber.
> *non* haec Calliope, *non* haec mihi cantat Apollo,
> *ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.*

Note the shift to *nobis* (4) for variation in the climax. Having singled out *ipsa puella* as the source of his *ingenium*, Propertius proceeds to list (5-14), with delightful humor, the great range of Cynthia's accomplishments which inspire his song. This is then completed with the summary statement (15-16):

> seu quidquid fecit sive est quodcumque locuta,
> *maxima* de nihilo nascitur historia.

Then begins a hypothetical list of grand-style themes (19-24) which he would reject (note *veteres*, 21 and *prima*, 23, suggesting that such themes are hackneyed), were he to attempt heroic verse. This is foil for the climax (25-26):

> bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris, et tu
> Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores.

Having thus singled out his (hypothetical) subject, he then provides yet another list of deeds (27-34), this time Caesar's,[45] capped by the couplet in which he links Maecenas (= *te*, 35) with those *res gestae* (35-36):

---

[45] They culminate, naturally, in Actium (34).

te mea Musa illis semper contexeret armis,
et sumpta et posita pace fidele caput...

At this point the text breaks down. Presumably Propertius compared the fidelity (cf. *fidele caput*, 36) of Maecenas to Augustus with the famous pairs of friends Theseus-Perithoos and Achilles-Patroclus, perhaps in a priamel.

The pivotal point of the entire poem is the *sed* at 39, when the poet returns to reality: just as Callimachus would not write about the battles of Gods and Giants, neither would Propertius try to write an *Aeneid*. Then, in order to introduce the real theme of his song, he uses a priamel to highlight his dedication to love poetry (43-46):

navita de ventis, de tauris narrat arator,
enumerat miles vulnera, pastor ovis;
nos contra angusto versantes proelia lecto:
qua pote quisque, in ea conterat arte diem.

Now that he has reintroduced his proper domain, he can protest his faithfulness to this one girl (= theme) (46-56). Then, in order to emphasize the inescapable power of love's grip on him, he uses a summary priamel (57-58):

omnis humanos sanat medicina dolores:
solus amor morbi non amat artificem.

Then follows an illustrative list of examples (58-64) of famous medical cures, capped (in adversative asyndeton) with the poet's incurable case (65):

hoc si quis vitium poterit mihi demere, *solus*...

Note the superlative force of *solus*. This is then followed by a list of ἀδύνατα (66-70), an elaborate way of saying *nemo poterit*. He can then close the poem with an address to Maecenas (73-78) to have pity on his miserable fate of having such a *dura puella* (78). This analysis of 2.1 shows how Propertius used priamels and lists to compose the entire poem, essentially elaborating on a simple sequence of ideas.

Another such poem, whose structure is even more obvious, is 3.2, in which he claims immortality for his love-poetry. It is composed of three priamels: 3-10 (Orpheus tamed beasts, Amphion moved rocks, Polyphemus charmed Galatea; is there any wonder why girls love my poetry?); 11-16 (I have no expensive house, no orchards, no grottoes; but the Muses are with me); 19-26 affirm the immortality of his *ingenium*:

nam neque Pyramidum sumptus ad sidera ducti,
nec Iovis Elei caelum imitata domus,
nec Mausolei dives fortuna sepulcri
mortis ab extrema condicione vacant.
aut illis flamma aut imber subducet honores,
annorum aut ictu, pondere victa, ruent.
at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aevo
excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus.

Poem 3.22 in praise of Rome bears a formal resemblance to Vergil's treatment of the same theme in *Georg.* 2.109-176, in that both are built on priamels (cf. *supra* pp. 120-121). In 3.22.7-16 are listed wondrous sights throughout the world (*tu licet aspicias...*, 7),[46] which are then outdone (ὑπεροχή)[47] by Rome (17-18):

omnia Romanae cedent miracula terrae:
natura *hic* posuit, quidquid ubique fuit.

Having thus introduced his theme, the poet goes on to praise Rome for her military might, her *pietas* (21), and her temperate use of power (22). Then, after a catalogue of Italian waters (21-26), the poet introduces his closing statements with another priamel, which lists the horrors (27-38) of which Italy is exempt.[48] Then, in contrast, the poem ends with the desirable qualities which Tullus will find at Rome (39-42):

haec tibi, Tulle, parens, *haec* est *pulcherrima* sedes,
hic tibi pro digna gente petendus honos,
hic tibi ad eloquium cives, *hic* ampla nepotum
spes et venturae coniugis aptus amor.

The climax of this priamel is a clever praise of Tullus' own qualities, and it is not by accident that the final attraction mentioned by a love poet is *aptus amor* (42).

In sum, Propertius exhibits a dazzling variety in his use of priamels, and although many are merely methodical amplifications of simple basic ideas, no small number bear the stamp of that *ingenium* whose immortality the poet predicted in *Elegy* 3.2.

---

[46] Note the motif of the journey.

[47] On "outdoing" cf. E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, W. R. Trask, trans., (New York 1953) 162-165. This example is a forerunner of the ones mentioned by Curtius, and the word *cedent* (17) along with the later *taceat* are almost technical terms. Both ideas are included at Mart. *lib. spect.* 1.7-8 (and note *sileat*, 1). Cf. also *cedite* at Prop. 2.2.13 and 2.34.65.

[48] Cf. Vergil *Georg.* 2.140-144, but included in Propertius' list are many of the epic and tragic themes conventionally rejected by elegiac poets.

5. *Ovid*

The frequency and variety of priamels which we noted in Propertius is even more pronounced in Ovid's elegiac verse (excluding the *Fasti*). As in the case of Propertius, he rarely makes a general statement without giving examples to support it, and when, as often happens, multiple examples are foil for a climactic point, then they constitute a priamel (even when embedded in a longer rhetorical development).

Because he employs so many examples in his elegiac verse, Ovid's priamels are often diffuse. For example, at *Ex P.* 4.3.35 ff., he wishes to impress upon his fair-weather friend the instability of human fortune (a regular τόπος of declamation). He begins with a *gnome* (35-36):

> omnia sunt hominum tenui pendentia filo,
> et subito casu quae valuere, ruunt.

This general observation (note *omnia*, 35) is then supported in good syllogistic fashion with particular examples of Croesus (37-38), Dionysius I (39-40), Pompey (41-42), and Marius (43-48). Then the general conclusion is drawn (49-50):

> ludit in humanis divina potentia rebus,
> et certam praesens vix habet hora fidem.

This summary statement is then followed by the example of the poet himself (51-56), and the poem finally ends with the "point" towards which this entire series of examples has been developing (57-58):[49]

> *tu quoque* fac timeas, et quae tibi laeta videntur
> dum loqueris, fieri tristia posse puta.

Of all the Latin poets, Ovid is best known for his wit, and this is quite evident in his use of priamels. Since the climax of a priamel can be strikingly different from the preceding examples, there is considerable scope for a witty, often bathetic or mock-heroic con-

---

[49] Other examples of this "inductive" priamel, where multiple exempla lead to a change of subject or person with *quoque* include: *Am.* 1.3.21-26, *nos quoque*; *Tr.* 1.1.75-81, *me quoque*; *Tr.* 4.1.5-19, *me quoque*; *Tr.* 4.6.31-37, *nos quoque*; *Tr.* 4.8.17-24, *me quoque*; *Tr.* 5.12.23-31, *me quoque*; *Ex P.* 1.3.19-26, *cura quoque*; *Ex P.* 1.4.11-20, *me quoque*; *Ex P.* 1.6.27-44, *me quoque*; *Ex P.* 2.3.41-48, *tu quoque*; *Ex P.* 2.5.59-64, *tu quoque*; *Ex P.* 3.1.51-56, *nos quoque*; *Ex P.* 3.2.9-16, *me quoque*; *Her.* 17.193-196, *tu quoque*.

clusion. For example, to round out his discussion of the importance of one's hair, he resorts to a priamel (*A.A.* 3.249-250):

turpe pecus mutilum, turpis sine gramine campus,
et sine fronde frutex, *et sine crine caput.*

He can also use priamels with ἀδύνατα for humorous purposes, as at *A.A.* 1.271-273:[50]

vere prius volucres taceant, aestate cicadae,
Maenalius lepori det sua terga canis,
femina quam iuveni blande temptata repugnet.

Humor is also evident in the priamel in his mock-serious *epicedion* for his mistress' deceased parrot (*Am.* 2.6.33-38):

vivit edax vultur ducensque per aera gyros
milvus et pluviae graculus auctor aquae;
vivit et armiferae cornix invisa Minervae,
illa quidem saeclis vix moritura novem.
occidit ille loquax humanae vocis imago
psittacus, extremo munus ab orbe datum.

At *A.A.* 3.251-256, Ovid defines his audience by means of a priamel:

non mihi venistis, Semele Ledeve, docendae,
perque fretum falso Sidoni vecta bove
aut Helene, quam non stulte, Menelae, reposcis,
tu quoque non stulte, Troice raptor, habes;
turba docenda venit pulchrae turpesque puellae,
pluraque sunt semper deteriora bonis.

And at *A.A.* 3.121-127 occurs the well-known priamel with which Ovid expresses his delight in belonging to his sophisticated age:

prisca iuvent alios, ego me nunc denique natum
gratulor: haec aetas moribus apta meis,
non quia nunc terrae lentum subducitur aurum
lectaque diverso litore concha venit,

[50] Cf. *Am.* 2.17.31-34 and *A.A.* 3.149-151. More often, especially in the later works, the ἀδύνατα in the form of a priamel constitute serious protestations (usually of constancy). Cf. *Met.* 13.324-327 and 14.37-39 (both in speeches), *Tr.* 1.8.1-10, *Tr.* 4.1.57-59, *Tr.* 4.7.11-20, *Tr.* 5.13.21-23, *Ex P.* 1.6.51-53, *Ex P.* 2.4.25-29, *Ex P.* 4.5.41-44, *Ex P.* 4.6.45-50, *Ex P.* 4.12.33-37, and *Ibis* 31-39. Related to this is the topic of innumerability, which Catullus employs with such grace at 7.3-10. In his later works, Ovid uses it more seriously to emphasize the great number of *mala* which he is suffering. Cf. *Tr.* 5.1.31-34, *Tr.* 5.2.23-27, *Tr.* 5.6.37-41, and *Ibis* 199-204.

nec quia decrescunt effosso marmore montes,
  nec quia caeruleae mole fugantur aquae,
sed quia cultus adest...

In the *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*, there is a great deal of ingenious humor in the choice of particular examples. For instance, in *Am.* 1.10 Ovid uses two priamels to censure his mistress' venality. In the first one (25-29) he appeals to the behavior of animals with an *argumentum a fortiori*:[51]

sumite in exemplum pecudes ratione carentes:
  turpe erit, ingenium mitius esse feris.
non equa munus equum, non taurum vacca poposcit,
  non aries placitam munere captat ovem.
sola viro mulier spoliis exultat ademptis...

In the second one (37-42) he argues by analogy from the law courts:

nec bene conducti vendunt periuria testes
  nec bene selecti iudicis arca patet;
turpe reos empta miseros defendere lingua,
  quod faciat magnas, turpe tribunal, opes;
turpe tori reditu census augere paternos
  et faciem lucro prostituisse suam.

At *A.A.* 2.373-377, he uses a priamel to describe the fury of a woman who discovers another woman in bed with her husband:[52]

sed neque fulvus aper media tam saevus in ira est,
  fulmineo rabidos cum rotat ore canes,
nec lea, cum catulis lactantibus ubera praebet,
  nec brevis ignaro vipera laesa pede
femina quam socii deprensa paelice lecti...

At *Am.* 2.17.14 ff., Ovid tries to convince his mistress that she should not scorn him just because he is inferior to her, and he quotes the general principle: *aptari magnis inferiora licet* (14). This is then expanded by means of examples: Calypso-Odysseus, Thetis-

---

[51] Cf. Theogn. 183-188 and above, note 18.

[52] Cf. also the delightful priamel at *A.A.* 1.723-729:

candidus in nauta turpis color, aequoris unda
  debet et a radiis sideris esse niger;
turpis et agricolae, qui vomere semper adunco
  et gravibus rastris sub Iove versat humum;
et tua, Palladiae petitur cui fama coronae,
  candida si fuerint corpora, turpis eris.
palleat omnis amans: hic est color aptus amanti.

Peleus, Egeria-Numa, Venus-Vulcan. Then he adds one more example for good measure (21-22):

carminis hoc ipsum genus impar, sed tamen apte
  iungitur herous cum breviore modo.

Then comes the "point" (23): *tu quoque me, mea lux, in quaslibet accipe leges.*

Perhaps in imitation of Prop. 2.1.1-16 (cf. *supra* p. 138), Ovid's *Am.* 2.4.9-48 expands at much greater length the multitude of attractions to which his *ambitiosus amor* (48) is drawn. This delightful catalogue of feminine qualities becomes so inclusive, that it is necessary to end it (as did Propertius) with a summary climax (47-48):[53]

denique quas tota quisquam probat urbe puellas,
  noster in has omnis ambitiosus amor.

Am. 1.10 begins with a priamel much like Prop. 1.3 (*qualis* ... *qualis* ... *talis*) with a series of similes describing his mistress, but Ovid then turns the whole priamel into foil in line 9: *nunc timor omnis abest*, when it is revealed that his fears were ungrounded since she demands payment.

Ovid uses so many priamels just as means of amplification, that it is difficult to classify them and impossible to discuss all of them. At most any occasion in his elegiacs where there is an opportunity for expansion, he fleshes out his thought with examples and priamels. Consequently, there are so many of them that few really stand out. Unlike Vergil, who uses one priamel in the entire *Aeneid* to say something truly memorable, Ovid's technique, stemming from Tibullus and Propertius, creates a stylistic stereotype, whose very frequency attenuates the striking quality which is the essence of priamels. This is especially true of the later poems, the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, in which the wit and delightfulness of the earlier poems almost disappear. If one compares the priamel of, say, *Am.*

---

[53] Note *quisquam* (47) and *quidquid* at Prop. 2.1.14 used to summarize in the climax. There is a similar use of *denique* to mark the climax at *Her.* 1.17-22, *Her.* 4.77-84, *Tr.* 2.495-496 (after a long list in 363-494). Also cf. *Ex P.* 3.3.41-46, where *nomina neu referam longum collecta per aevum* (45) = *denique* (cf. *R.A.* 453-462); and finally, after an enormous list of horrors to be visited on his anonymous enemy, Ovid wittily adds the last (and, of course, the worst of all) at *Ibis* 637-638:

denique Sarmaticas inter Geticasque sagittas
  his precor ut vivas et moriare locis.

2.10.31-36,[54] which is in the tradition of Tibullus 1.1-6:

induat adversis contraria pectora telis
  miles et aeternum sanguine nomen emat;
quaerat avarus opes et, quae lassarit arando,
  aequora periuro naufragus ore bibat;
at mihi contingat Veneris languescere motu,
  cum moriar, medium solvar et inter opus.

or the priamel in the tradition of Propertius at *Am.* 2.1.29-34:

quid mihi profuerit velox cantatus Achilles?
  quid pro me Atrides alter et alter agent,
quique tot errando quot bello perdidit annos,
  raptus et Haemoniis flebilis Hector equis?
at facie tenerae laudata saepe puellae
  ad vatem, pretium carminis, ipsa venit.

with the more serious, and somewhat mechanical, priamel of *Tr.* 4.6.1-18:[55]

Tempore ruricolae patiens fit taurus aratri,
  praebet et incurvo colla premenda iugo;
tempore paret equus lentis animosus habenis,
  et placido duros accipit ore lupos;
tempore Poenorum compescitur ira leonum,
  nec feritas animo, quae fuit ante, manet;
quaeque sui monitis obtemperat Inda magistri
  belua, servitium tempore victa subit.
tempus ut extensis tumeat facit uva racemis,
  vixque merum capiant grana quod intus habent;
tempus et in canas semen producit aristas,
  et ne sint tristi poma sapore cavet.
hoc tenuat dentem terram renovantis aratri,
  hoc rigidas silices, hoc adamanta terit;
hoc etiam saevas paulatim mitigat iras,
  hoc minuit luctus maestaque corda levat.
cuncta potest *igitur* tacito pede lapsa vetustas
  praeterquam curas attenuare meas.

the differences are striking. The wit of the love poems makes them graceful and charming, whereas the querulous tone of the later poems makes them tedious.

---

[54] Cf. also *Am.* 3.2.43-57 (the procession of the gods) and *A.A.* 2.735-738.

[55] Other examples include *Tr.* 2.266-276, *Tr.* 1.2.5-12, *Tr.* 5.5.51-60, *Ex P.* 4.4.1-10, and *Ex P.* 4.10.1-8.

But perhaps the best way to describe the breadth and versatility of Ovid's technique at its richest is by examining the dazzling group of priamels which opens the *Ars Amatoria*. After announcing his programme in the opening couplet (1-2):

> Si quis in hoc artem populo non novit amandi,
> hoc legat et lecto carmine doctus amet.

he uses a priamel (a nice parody of Nestor's advice to Antilochus at *Il.* 23.315-318)[56] to emphasize by analogy the place of *ars* in *amor* (3-4):

> arte citae veloque rates remoque moventur,
> arte leves currus: *arte regendus amor.*

Note the more intensive gerundive in the climax. Immediately follows another priamel, which (chiastically) develops the categories of chariot-driving and sailing by naming the exemplary practitioners of each, so that the poet can climactically introduce himself as the art's most knowledgeable theorist (5-7):

> curribus Automedon lentisque erat aptus habenis,
> Tiphys in Haemonia puppe magister erat:
> *me Venus* artificem tenero praefecit Amori;
> Tiphys et Automedon dicar Amoris ego.

Then (11-18) is an extended comparison, which wittily compares the high-spirited and unpredictable Achilles with Cupid and his master Chiron with Ovid, the poet establishes his credentials as the *praeceptor Amoris* (17).[57]

This is then followed by a priamel to demonstrate that Amor is susceptible to instruction (19-22):

> sed tamen et tauri cervix oneratur aratro,
> frenaque magnanimi dente teruntur equi:
> *et mihi cedet Amor*, quamvis mea vulneret arcu
> pectora, iactatas excutiatque faces.

---

[56] Cf. the "Doctrinae commendatio" quoted by K. Euling (*Intro.*, n. 1) 115 [= P.L. (Migne) 171, 1684, n. 49]:

> Cum sine doctrina nil proficiat medicina,
> nec sine doctrina tendantur in aequora lina,
> nec sine doctrina portum petat ulla carina:
> *audi* doctrinam, si vis vitare ruinam.

[57] It may be for the sake of variety that Ovid does *not* employ a priamel here.

Next Ovid uses a priamel to assert (as had Tibullus at 1.8.1 ff. and Propertius at 2.1.1 ff.; cf. *supra* pp. 132 and 138), that his knowledge is based on practical experience (25-29):

non ego, Phoebe, datas a te mihi mentiar artes,
nec nos aeriae voce monemur avis,
nec mihi sunt visae Clio Cliusque sorores
servanti pecudes vallibus, Ascra, tuis;
usus opus movet hoc: vati parete perito...

At lines 43 ff., Ovid counsels that there is effort involved in love, for the girl must be sought (*quaerenda est...puella*, 44), and then employs a priamel to demonstrate this (45-50):

scit bene venator, cervis ubi retia tendat;
scit bene, qua frendens valle moretur aper;
aucupibus noti frutices; qui sustinet hamos,
novit quae multo pisce natentur aquae:
tu quoque, materiam longo qui quaeris amori,
ante frequens quo sit disce puella loco.

But, says the poet (51-52), don't think that you will have to travel to distant places to find your quarry, and uses yet another priamel to reinforce his statement (53-56):

Andromedan Perseus nigris portarit ab Indis,
raptaque sit Phrygio Graia puella viro;
tot tibi tamque dabit formosas Roma puellas,
'haec habet' ut dicas '*quicquid* in orbe fuit'.

The summary word *quicquid* (56) is then expanded by another priamel (the innumerability τόπος) in order to express the vast number of women available in Rome (57-60):[58]

Gargara quot segetes, quot habet Methymna racemos,
aequore quot pisces, fronde teguntur aves,
quot caelum stellas, *tot habet tua Roma puellas*:
mater in Aeneae constitit urbe sui.

Then follows a magnificent catalogue (61-264)—with delightful digressions—on where to snare girls (*ubi retia ponas*, 263). This dazzling display of poetic *copia* at the beginning of the *Ars Amatoria*, with its wittily chosen examples, its linking together of the worlds of mythology, nature, hunting, love, and Rome, is in its very exuberance a testimony to the vitality of the priamel.

[58] On the τόπος cf. above, note 50. Note the ἐπιφώνημα in line 60.

E. NERONIAN POETRY

1. *Petronius*

There are two priamels of note in the metrical portions of the *Satyricon.*[59] The first is at *Sat.* 137.9.1-10:

quisquis habet nummos, secura navigat aura
  fortunamque suo temperat arbitrio.
uxorem ducat Danaen ipsumque licebit
  Acrisium iubeat credere quod Danaen.
carmina componat, declamet, concrepet omnes
  et peragat causas sitque Catone prior.
iurisconsultus 'parret, non parret' habeto
  atque esto quicquid Servius et Labeo.
multa loquor: quod vis nummis praesentibus *opta,*
  et veniet. clausum possidet arca Iovem.

It begins with the general proposition (cynical at that) that anyone (*quisquis,* 1) with money can do what he wants. Then follows a list of examples (3-8), cut short with *multa loquor* (9), which signals the climax. Notable in this summary climax[60] is the change of subject (*quod vis,* 11), the imperative, and the ἐπιφώνημα: *clausum possidet arca Iovem.*

The other occurs at 83.10.1-6, where Eumolpus explains why in spite of his great verbal talents he is dressed so poorly:

qui pelago credit, magno se faenore tollit;
qui pugnas et castra petit, praecingitur auro;
vilis adulator picto iacet ebrius ostro,
et qui sollicitat nuptas, ad praemia peccat:
sola pruinosis horret facundia pannis
atque inopi lingua desertas invocat artes.

Although other pursuits bring profit, eloquence does not. The prominent *sola* (5) marks the climactic term as exceptional.[61] This is

[59] O. Crusius (RE V 2, col. 2305) noted features of the priamel in certain elegiacs in Petronius (*Sat.* 83, 137, and *frr.* 26 and 32). The first two are discussed below; the last two consist more of lists which illustrate a point. On *fr.* 30, cf. below, note 76.

[60] Cf. Prop. 2.1.15-16 (*supra* p. 138) and Ovid *Am.* 2.4.47-48 (*supra* p. 144). Here *multa loquor* (9) is equivalent to *denique,* and *quid vis* (9) is equivalent to *quodcumque.*

[61] Just before this example, there is a similar priamel in prose, when Encolpius contrasts his situation with the amorous affairs of the gods at 83.4-6. Note the summary *omnes* (83.5) and the evaluative motif in *crudeliorem* (83.6). On *solus* as a topic of amplification, cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1.6.28 and 1.9.25 (τὰ μόνῳ ὑπάρχοντα).

one of a number of such priamels, where the examples lead to one conclusion, but the cap proves to be extraordinary.[62]

2. *Seneca*

Apart from some brief priamels in Lucan's *Pharsalia*[63] and in Seneca's prose works (e.g. *Ep.* 36.7-8 and 50.6), the majority of examples in the Neronian period comes from Seneca's drama. In spite of the fact that they often serve merely to amplify a point, they also show considerable variety.

At *H.F.* 838-849 the chorus portrays the vast number of souls in Hades through a series of analogies of people flocking to great public events (a new theater, the Olympic games, the Eleusinian mysteries). Similarly, at *Oed.* 600-607, Creon uses the innumerability τόπος (*non tot...quot*) to depict the great number of souls conjured up by the priest.

Seneca frequently uses the stereotyped priamels of asseveration for "never!" At *H.O.* 1576 ff. occur the two principal types. One is at 1576-1580:[64]

> vere *dum* flores venient tepenti
> et comam silvis hiemes recident,
> vel comam silvis revocabit aestas
> pomaque autumno fugiente cedent,
> *nulla te* terris rapiet vetustas.

The other is at 1582-1586:[65]

> *ante* nascetur seges in profundo
> vel fretum dulci resonabit unda,
> *ante* descendet glacialis ursae
> sidus et ponto vetito fruetur,
> *quam tuas* laudes populi quiescant.

At the end of her prayer to Cupid, asking him to make Hercules fall in love with her, Deianira uses a brief priamel, in which the *hypomnesis* contains examples of his earlier successes, while the request is the climactic term (*H.O.* 558-562):

---

[62] Cf. *supra* p. 33 n. 4. Krischer (*Intro.*, n. 19) 85-86 detects an enthymeme in this priamel, but the poet is merely emphasizing the uniqueness of his situation.

[63] E.g. *Phars.* 1.89-92, 93-95; 4.378-381; 10.17-20 and 474-478.

[64] Cf. *Med.* 401-407. At *Oed.* 503-508 the same form is used for "forever!"

[65] Cf. *H.O.* 335-338, *Hipp.* 568-573, and *Oct.* 222-226.

tu fulminantem *saepe* domuisti Iovem,
tu furva nigri sceptra gestantem poli,
turbae ducem maioris et dominum Stygis;
tuque, o noverca gravior irata deus,
cape hunc triumphum solus et *vince* Herculem.

Note the word *saepe* (558), which sums up many instances, the imperatives, the deictic *hunc*, and superlatives in *triumphum*, *solus*, and *vince* (562).

There are two choral passages consisting of priamels in praise of the life of moderate means. The first is *H.O.* 658-670:

coniunx modico nupta marito
non disposito clara monili
gestat pelagi dona rubentis,
nec gemmiferas detrahit aures
lapis Eoa lectus in unda,
nec Sidonio mollis aeno
repetita bibit lana rubores,
nec Maeonia distinguit acu
quae Phoebeis subditus euris
legit Eois Ser arboribus.
quaelibet herbae tinxere colus
quas indoctae nevere manus;
sed non dubios fovet *illa toros.*

In the same vein is the priamel at *H.F.* 192-197, which is in the tradition of Horace and Tibullus:[66]

alium multis gloria terris
tradat et omnes fama per urbes
garrula laudet caeloque parem
tollat et astris; *alius* curru
sublimis eat; *me mea* tellus
lare secreto tutoque tegat.

At *Hipp.* 540 ff. Hippolytus lists the evils which are rampant since the end of the Golden Age, and the catalogue concludes, naturally, with women (559):

sed dux malorum femina...

Finally, there are two priamels which are formally interesting, but border (as does much in Seneca's tragedies) on the grotesque. The first is in the prologue of the *Agamemnon*, when Thyestes names

[66] Cf. *Thy.* 455-469 for a similar form with *sed* (468) in the climax.

the four famous villains (Ixion, Sisyphus, Tityus, Tantalus) in Hades from which he has just come (15-21), only to cap their deeds with his own crimes (22-27):

sed ille nostrae pars quota est culpae senex?
reputemus *omnes* quos ob infandas manus
quaesitor urna Cnosius versat reos;
vincam Thyestes sceleribus cunctos meis.
a fratre vincar, liberis plenus tribus
in me sepultis; viscera exedi mea.

The purpose of the priamel is to establish a hierarchy of evil. Even the crimes of Tantalus, his ancestor, are only a fraction of Thyestes' offenses (note the rejection in the withheld word *senex*, 22). Thyestes then sums up *all* evildoers in Hell (*reputemus omnes*, 23) and tops them *all* (*vincam* ... *cunctos*, 25) with his crimes. At this point the priamel is formally completed, but he then goes on to surpass even this in the following two lines (26-27): *a fratre vincar....*

At *Thy.* 290-294 there is a priamel which typifies the ever present risk of frigidity when one strives too hard for a clever "point" out of season. In answer to his attendant's question as to how Atreus could expect his brother Thyestes to come and fall into their trap when he hates them so much, Atreus replies that he will come in the hope of gaining his crown (*regna nunc sperat mea*, 289). This is then followed with a priamel amplifying Thyestes' overmastering desire for rule (290-294):

hac spe minanti fulmen occurret Iovi,
hac spe subibit gurgitis tumidi minas
dubiumque Libycae Syrtis intrabit fretum,
hac spe, quod esse *maximum* retur malum,
fratrem videbit.

It is clear that Seneca wishes to emphasize how much Thyestes hates his brother, but after the examples of challenging Jupiter, Charybdis, and the Syrtes, *fratrem videbit* (294) cannot but seem a bit forced, if not downright ψυχρόν.

3. *Persius*

In his introductory satire, Persius establishes his position with respect to the satiric tradition by means of two priamels. The first places him in the Roman tradition, in the footsteps of Lucilius and Horace (1.114-119):

secuit Lucilius urbem,
te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis.
omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit,
callidus excusso populum suspendere naso.
me muttire nefas? nec clam? nec cum scrobe? nusquam?

The second places him in the Greek tradition (1.123-125):

audaci quicumque adflate Cratino
iratum Eupolidem praegrandi cum sene palles,
aspice et haec, si forte aliquid decoctius audis.

Persius shows considerable variety in these two priamels. First is the difference in treatment of the *exempla*: the Roman more fully, the Greek schematically. Secondly, the first climax is in the form of a rhetorical question (*me muttire nefas?* = *me muttire certe fas est*!), while the second has an imperative and is inclusive (*et haec*, note the deictic pronoun).[67]

At *Sat.* 5.52 ff., Persius sketches the various kinds of lives that men lead in order to contrast these pursuits with his mentor Coruntus' devotion to (Stoic) philosophy (52-62):

mille hominum species et rerum *discolor* usus;
velle *suum cuique* est *nec voto* vivitur *uno*.
mercibus his Italis mutat sub sole recenti
rugosum piper et pallentis grana cumini,
hic satur inriguo mavult turgescere somno,
hic campo indulget, hunc alea decoquit, ille
in venerem putris; sed cum lapidosa cheragra
fregerit articulos veteris ramalia fagi,
tunc crassos transisse dies lucemque palustrem
et sibi iam seri vitam ingemuere relictam.
at te nocturnis *iuvat* inpallescere chartis...

The summary motifs implicit in the words *mille* (52), *discolor* (52), *suum cuique* (53), and *nec voto...uno* (53) are then expanded in a manner somewhat reminiscent of Horace C. 1.1.3 ff. to include five examples of lives, whose wastefulness is summed up in lines 58-61, before being contrasted with the pursuits of Cornutus (62).[68]

---

[67] For other priamels which place the writer at the end of his tradition, cf. *supra* p. 136.

[68] *iuvat* (62) is a common word to indicate a προαίρεσις; cf. Hor. C. 3.19.18, *Epod.* 2.49, and *Epis.* 1.14.35. The Loeb translator begins a new paragraph at 62.

F. FLAVIAN AND LATER POETRY

1. *Martial*

There are surprisingly few priamels in his contemporary Statius' poetry,[69] but there are quite a few in Martial's epigrams. The poem which opens the *Liber de Spectaculis* is a priamel and has the function of highlighting the subject of the book: the Flavian amphitheater.

Barbara pyramidum sileat miracula Memphis,
  Assyrius iactet nec Babylona labor;
nec Triviae templo molles laudentur Iones,
  dissimulet Delon cornibus ara frequens;
aere nec vacuo pendentia Mausolea
  laudibus inmodicis Cares in astra ferant.
omnis Caesareo cedit labor Amphitheatro,
  unum pro cunctis fama loquetur opus.

The context concerns the "wonders (*miracula*, 1) of the world,"[70] all of which (according to the poet) are surpassed by the Colosseum. Although the form is quite straightforward, this little epigram contains some noteworthy features. The word *sileat* (1) "let Memphis keep silent," followed by *iactet* (2), *laudentur* (3), *laudibus* (6) and *loquetur* (8), indicates that the epigram is not just about *miracula*, but specifically about the *praise* of them. Martial has not only amplified the subject of his book, but has established his place in praising it: as the others yield place (*cedit*, 7) to the Colosseum, so their praises are eclipsed (*sileat*, 1),[71] indeed, are mere boasting (cf. *iactet*, 2; *dissimulet*, 4; *laudibus inmodicis*, 6). Besides the geographical expansion, which is common in such priamels ("foreign"—*barbara*, 1—as opposed to the local), is the summary word *omnis* (7), which rejects *en masse* all wonders for Caesar's amphitheater, and the happy phrase *unum pro cunctis* (8), by which all the others are, as it were, "summed up" in this latest marvel, whose fame alone (*unum* has much of the superlative force of *solum*) will live (*fama loquetur*, 8).

A more modest example, closer in spirit to Horace C. 1.7.1-14 (*laudabunt alii...*), is 4.55.1-11:

---

[69] I have found but two examples at *Silv.* 2.6.1-10 and 3.3.79-84, and they are quite minor.

[70] Cf. *A.P.* 9.58.

[71] Cf. above, note 47, and the priamel at *lib. spect.* 28.11-12

Fucinus et diri *taceantur* stagna Neronis:
  hanc norint *unam* saecula naumachiam.

Luci, gloria temporum tuorum,
qui Caium veterem Tagumque nostrum
Arpis cedere non sinis disertis:
Argivas generatus inter urbes
Thebas carmine cantet aut Mycenas,
aut claram Rhodon aut libidinosae
Ledaeas Lacedaemonos palaestras:
nos Celtis genitos et ex Hiberis
nostrae nomina duriora terrae
grato non pudeat referre versu:
saevo Bilbilin *optimam* metallo...

The spirited praise of their homeland which follows (12-26) indicates that the expression *nos... non pudeat referre* (8-10) is litotes for *iactemus*.

Martial, like Ovid, is famous for his wit, and also uses priamels for humorous effects, as in 1.43, where he lists all the items which were *not* served at the dinner, in order to lead up to the punch-line (9-10):

nudus aper, *sed* et *hic minimus* qualisque necari
  a non armato pumilione potest.

Note the summary *nudus* and the superlative *minimus*, followed by the humorous exaggeration of line 10. Other priamels, whose caps are surprises, include 3.26, where Candidus has a whole list of possessions all to himself (*solus*), all of which are summed up in line 5 before the climax:

omnia solus habes—hoc me puta velle negare!—
  uxorem sed habes, Candide, *cum populo*.

At 8.81.1-4, Gellia does not swear by Dindymene nor by Apis, nor, summing up (note *denique*) (3-4):

nullos denique per deos deasque
iurat Gellia, *sed per uniones*.

At 10.74, in imitation of the priamels found in prayers (e.g. Horace C. 1.31), where a list of items is rejected before the true request is made, Martial, tired of being a *cliens*, does not ask for the luxuries of Apulia, Hybla, Egypt, or Setia (note the geographical motif), rather (12):

quid concupiscam *quaeris* ergo? *dormire*.

In these three examples is evident that feature which is especially common in the "pointed" epigrammatic style, the withholding of

the key word until the very end of the line: *cum populo* (3.26.6, in elegiacs), *uniones* (8.81.4, in hendecasyllabics), and *dormire* (10.74.12, in choliambics).[72]

Martial also uses priamels in order to highlight his poetry. In 10.2, "Rome" commends his readers to the poet as her greatest gift (for they will assure his immortality), and concludes (9-12):

marmora Messallae findit caprificus et audax
  dimidios Crispi mulio ridet equos:
at chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt,
  *sola*que non norunt *haec* monumenta mori.

At 10.87.8-18, Martial lists the various contributions of various people for the celebration of Restitutus' birthday, and he caps the list with his own gift (perhaps this very poem?) (19-20):

si mittit *sua quisque*, *quid* poetam
missurum tibi, Restitute, credis?

In Epigram 1.61, he caps a list of birthplaces of famous Latin poets (and authors) with (naturally) his own Bilbilis:

Verona docti syllabas amat vatis,
  Marone felix Mantua est,
censetur Aponi Livio suo tellus
  Stellaque nec Flacco minus,
Apollodoro plaudit imbrifer Nilus,
  Nasone Paeligni sonant,
duosque Senecas unicumque Lucanum
  facunda loquitur Corduba,
gaudent iocosae Canio suo Gades,
  Emerita Deciano meo:
te, Liciniane, gloriabitur nostra
  nec *me* tacebit Bilbilis.

Finally, in his programmatic poem 10.4.1-10, he uses two priamels as *recusationes* by listing those themes which are not found in his poems:

---

[72] Cf. 1.39.8, *hic Decianus erit*; 3.20.21, *ridet*; 9.22.16, *aedificem*; 2.7.8, *ardalio*; 3.72.8, *fatua es*; 12.65.8, *vini*; and 6.4.5, *quod pudica est*. Martial is also fond of using a priamel as a means of singling out superiority. Cf. 2.2.1-3, where the honorific titles won in Crete and Africa (for the latter Scipio and Metellus are named) yield (*nobilius*, 3) to Domitian's title of Germanicus. He can also use the form for witty or humorous effect, as at 1.104 [noted by O. Weinrich, *Studien zu Martial* (Stuttgart 1928) 99-100, who mentions the need for a study of the priamels in Martial], 4.4.1-12, 9.57.1-13, and 11.8.1-12.

Qui legis Oedipoden caligantemque Thyesten,
Colchidas et Scyllas, quid nisi monstra legis?
quid tibi raptus Hylas, quid Parthenopaeus et Attis,
quid tibi dormitor proderit Endymion?
exutusve puer pinnis labentibus? aut qui
odit amatrices Hermaphroditus aquas?
quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae?
hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita 'Meum est.'
non hic Centauros, *non* Gorgonas Harpyiasque
invenies: *hominem* pagina *nostra* sapit.

2. *Juvenal*

In an author where rhetorical amplification and examples of every sort abound, it is a bit surprising that there are not many priamels, and none of particular eminence. In fact, the only ones of note are in *Satire* 10. The first comes in lines 8-13. The poet has made the point that men are often destroyed by their own wishes, and he gives as examples eloquence (note the summary *multis*, 9) and physical strength. Then he caps them with (12-13):

sed pluris nimia congesta pecunia cura
strangulat...

Having singled out this most prevalent cause of destruction, he then expands on its dire consequences. And further on, after listing the physical debilities of old age (227-232), he caps these with failures of the mind (232-233):

sed omni
membrorum damno *maior* dementia...

As in the previous example, the priamel is used simply as a transitional device to introduce a new subject for expansion.

3. *Nemesianus*

The trend in the third and later centuries towards copious expansion of classical forms is well known, and it is evident in priamels as well. While the first-century author of the *Aetna* used the following priamel to highlight the "intention of his poem" (*mens carminis*, 28) (17-24):[73]

[73] This form of introduction (a *recusatio* in the form of an extended priamel) to a "scientific" treatise begins as early as Verg. *Georg.* 3.3-9. It is fair to note that rhetorical *copia*, while a trend in later Latin poetry, is not the exclusive possession of it. It can be seen also in the long priamel at Manilius *Astr.* 3.5-31, in the Latin elegiac poets, and even in Ibycus *fr.* 3D (= 282 PMG).

ultima quis tacuit iuvenum certamina, Colchos?
quis non Argolico deflevit Pergamon igni
impositam et tristi natorum funere matrem
aversumve diem sparsumve in semine dentem?
quis non periurae doluit mendacia puppis,
desertam vacuo Minoida litore questus?
quicquid in *antiquum* iactata est fabula carmen.
fortius ignotas moli*mur* pectore curas...

the late third-century poet Nemesianus expands the same form in his *Cynegetica* to 34 verses with no fewer than twenty examples![74] This *tour de force* combines many aspects of the tradition, and has considerable variety in its presentation of examples. It begins (like the *Aetna*) with questions: *quis non...iam cecinit*? (15-20), then switches to the form (like Horace C. 1.1) *sunt qui* (21-42), and finally ends with a spate of examples introduced by *non canimus* (43-45). He then sums up (as does the author of the *Aetna*), before the climactic announcement of his theme (46-49):

haec iam magnorum praecepit *copia* vatum,
omnis et antiqui vulgata est fabula saecli.
nos saltus viridesque plagas camposque patentes
scrutamur...

This leisurely introduction exhibits a delight in the *copia* of which the priamel is capable, when the *exempla* are expanded for their own enjoyment, when the foil begins to take on more importance than the point being made.[75]

4. *Claudian*

In the *Praefatio* to his *Panegyric on the Sixth Consulship of Honorius* (XXVII), Claudian reports a dream in which he supposedly sang of Zeus' triumph over the Giants to the admiration of the heavenly assembly, only to awaken to an even more impressive reality in the presence of Honorius. But in order to introduce his dream, he employs a priamel (1-12), whose form and substance he has borrowed from the tradition. At 4.962 ff., Lucretius embarks on a

---

[74] Cf. also the priamel in the pastoral tradition at *Ecl.* 4.26-30.

[75] A remarkable example is the elegiac poem ascribed to Eucheria (7th cent.?) at *A.L.* I i p. 303 n. 390, which consists of 32 verses, in which the authoress employs 28 ἀδύνατα of impossible matches in order to refuse to marry a *rusticus*.

lengthy proof that we naturally dream about our normal activities, and in the course of it occurs the following priamel (966-970):[76]

causidici causas agere et componere leges,
induperatores pugnare ac proelia obire,
nautae contractum cum ventis degere bellum,
nos agere hoc autem et naturam quaerere rerum
semper et inventam patriis exponere chartis.

Perhaps in imitation of this passage, Claudian introduces his dream in the following way (1-12):

Omnia, quae sensu volvuntur vota diurno,
  pectore sopito reddit amica quies.
venator defessa toro cum membra reponit,
  mens tamen ad silvas et sua lustra redit.
iudicibus lites, aurigae somnia currus
  vanaque nocturnis meta cavetur equis.
furto gaudet amans, permutat navita merces
  et vigil elapsas quaerit avarus opes,
blandaque largitur frustra sitientibus aegris
  inriguus gelido pocula fonte sopor.
me quoque Musarum studium sub nocte silenti
  artibus adsuetis sollicitare solet.

This passage is not without its charm, in spite of the obvious multiplication of examples for their own sake.

In his *In Rufinum* 1.283-296, Claudian uses a priamel in order to emphasize the great extent of Rufinus' threat. This passage occurs in a larger context where Stilicho is being praised for "outdoing" the feats of Perseus, and it comes as no surprise that the labors of Hercules are mentioned next, but here Claudian neatly combines praise of Stilicho with censure of Rufinus:[77]

taceat superata vetustas,
Herculeos conferre tuis iam desinat actus.
una Cleonaeum pascebat silva leonem;
Arcadiae saltum vastabat dentibus unum
saevus aper, tuque o compressa matre rebellans

[76] This is a *locus communis*. Cf. Accius *Praetext.* 29-31 and [Sen.] *Oct.* 740-742. Petr. *fr.* 30 (Buecheler), if by Petronius, shows that proliferation of examples for their own sake occurs well before Nemesianus and Claudian. If this fragment were complete, there would presumably be some climax to the long list of examples.

[77] Cf. H. L. Levy, "Claudian's *In Rufinum* and Rhetorical Ψόγος, TAPA 77 (1946) 63-64. On *taceat superata vetustas*, cf. above, note 47.

non ultra Libyae fines, Antaee, nocebas,
solaque fulmineo resonabat Creta iuvenco
Lernaeamque virens obsederat hydra paludem.
hoc monstrum non una palus, non una tremebat
insula, sed Latia quidquid dicione subactum
vivit, et a primis Ganges horrebat Hiberis.

The obvious point of this priamel is that each of the foil terms only threatened one restricted area, whereas Rufinus threatened the entire world.[78] Here the priamel is just a part of a hyperbolic encomiastic/vituperative style which flourishes in the latter centuries of the Graeco-Roman world.

Other grandiose examples occur in the "*Laus Serenae*" (*Carm. min.* 30). After introducing his subject (lines 1-10), Claudian uses a priamel in order to amplify his topic with the "outdoing" formula. The long and complicated list of famous women who have been celebrated in song (12-32) is then capped by the present theme (the name is withheld until the end of the verse for climactic effect) (33):

non tamen audebunt titulis *certare* Serenae.

Further on, the poet uses another elaborate priamel in order to highlight the fact that the emperor himself betrothed Serena to Stilicho. To do this, he contrasts the examples of contested marriages of olden times (cf. *antiquos...reges*, 162): Pelops-Hippodameia, Hippomenes-Atalanta, Hercules-Deianira (lines 166-176). These examples are then briefly recapitulated and contrasted with Serena's marriage (177-180):[79]

te non Hesperidum pomis, non amne subacto,
non socerum fallente rota, *sed* iudice dignus
Augusto variis Stilicho spectatus in armis
accipit et regni dotes virtute paravit.

This is then followed by yet another priamel, which highlights Stilicho's own achievement in this affair (181-185):

saepe duces meritis bello tribuere coronas:
hunc cingit muralis honos; hunc civica quercus
nexuit; hunc domitis ambit rostrata carinis.
solus, militiae mira mercede, iugalem
promeruit *Stilicho* socero referente coronam.

[78] Inherent in this priamel is the logical flaw of supposing that superiority in one aspect means superiority overall. This fallacy is very common in later eulogy, where the *laudandus* is compared with figures from the past.

[79] This is a small priamel in its own right, showing how independent (if not gratuitous) the foil of 162-176 really is.

5. *Boethius*

After noting that Macrobius' *Saturnalia* begins with a summary priamel,[80] it is perhaps fitting to conclude this survey with the last metron (5.5) in Boethius' *Cons. Phil.*, which, a far distant cousin of Sophocles' "Ode to Man," highlights the uniqueness of man in nature, and exhorts him to use his natural endowments to lift his mind on high.

Quam *variis* terras *animalia* permeant figuris!
namque *alia* extento sunt corpore pulveremque verrunt
continuumque trahunt vi pectoris incitata sulcum,
sunt quibus alarum levitas vaga verberetque ventos
et liquido longi spatia aetheris enatet volatu,
haec pressisse solo vestigia gressibusque gaudent
vel virides campos transmittere vel subire silvas.
quae *variis* videas licet omnia discrepare formis,
prona tamen facies hebetes valet ingravare sensus.
unica gens hominum celsum levat altius cacumen
atque levis recto stat corpore despicitque terras.
haec nisi terrenus male desipis, admonet figura,
qui recto caelum vultu petis exserisque frontem,
in sublime feras animum quoque, ne gravata pessum
inferior sidat mens corpore celsius levato.

---

[80] Macr. *Sat.* 1.1: "Many and various, Eustachius my son, are the things on which in this life of ours Nature has led us to set our affections; but of all Nature's ties the strongest is our love for our children..." (P.V. Davies, tr.). Cf. also the summary priamel which opens the *Introduction* of de Tocqueville's *De la Démocratie en Amérique*: "Parmi les objets nouveaux qui, pendant mon séjour aux États-Unis, ont attiré mon attention, aucun n'a plus vivement frappé mes regards que l'égalité des conditions."

INDEX LOCORUM
(to the *Classical Priamel*)

Accius, *Praetext.* (ed. Warmington)
29-31: 158 n. 76
Aeschylus
Agamemnon
281-312: 50 n. 46
1001-1021: 39 n. 17
1008-1021: 87
Choephori
585ff.: 2, 14 n. 38, 17, 89-90
594-595: 87 n. 129
1075-1076: 88 n. 131
Eumenides
644-648: 87 n. 128
Persae
176-180: 88, 112 n. 194
375-632: 88 n. 131
759-786: 88
Septem
662-669: 88
Supplices
443-451: 39 n. 17, 87 n. 128
946-949: 87
Aetna
17-24: 156-157
Alcaeus (ed. L.-P.)
426: 63 n. 71
Alcman (ed. Page, PMG)
1: 2
1.64-77: 54-55
1.92-99: 54
16: 55-56
Alex. π. σχη. (ed. Spengel)
3.18.17ff.: 18
3.18.30-31: 20
3.19.11-13: 18
Anacreon (ed. Page, PMG)
361 (= 8D): 55 n. 57, 56 n. 58, 80 n. 109
Anacreontea (ed. Edmonds)
8: 108
9: 108
21: 109, 110 n. 191
23: 108
24: 110 n. 191
24.8-9: 109 n. 183
26: 108
27: 109
29: 108 n. 182
Anaxilas (ed. Kock)
ii 270: 110 n. 189
Anon. (*Literary Papyri*, ed. Page)
147.5-6: 13 n. 37
Anthologia Latina (ed. Riese)
i 2 p. 116, no. 648: 29
Anthologia Palatina
5.169: 110
5.246: 110
7.153: 28 n. 70, 110 n. 188
9.58: 110, 153 n. 70
9.110: 109
9.363: 6 n. 21, 109 n. 184, 110
9.575: 28 n. 70, 110
11.31: 110
11.58: 109
11.227: 110
11.239: 110
12.2: 108 n. 182, 109
12.94: 110
12.128: 110
14.73.7-8: 110
15.12: 109
16.1.1-2: 81
16.295: 45 n. 33
16.296: 44 n. 29, 45
16.337: 110
16.357: 110
Antiphanes (ed. Kock)
ii 70: 107 n. 180
Aphthonius, *Progymn.* (ed. Spengel)
2.27: 29
2.28.5-32.18: 53 n. 51
Apollonius Rhodius
1.1340-1342: 106 n. 175
Apsines, π. παθ. (ed. Spengel-Hammer)
1.327.8ff.: 93 n. 147
Archestratus (ed. Ribbeck)
fr. 59: 73
Archilochus (ed. West)
3: 57
19: 55 n. 57, 56, 80 n. 109
114: 55 n. 57, 56
122: 28

22 (ed. Diehl): 56 n. 58
60 (ed. Diehl): 4 n. 15
Aristides, *Orat.* (ed. Keil)
23.68: 63 n. 71
46.20: 44 n. 28
Aristocles, *h. Dem.* (= Aelian NA 11.4)
1-4: 44 n. 28
Aristophanes
Acharnians
1-20: 36 n. 11
Aves
860-861: 112 n. 194
Plutus
189-193: 33 n. 5
Ranae
1217-1219: 98 n. 157
Thesmophoriazusae
477-478: 35 n. 8
830-831: 35 n. 8, 112 n. 194
Aristotle, *Rhetoric* (ed. Freese)
1.2.3: 58 n. 62
1.6.28: 148 n. 61
1.9.25: 148 n. 61
1.9.39-40: 20
1.9.40: 94 n. 148
3.14.7: 22
3.14.12: 22 n. 62
Ausonius
Eclogue 5: 43 n. 25

Bacchylides (ed. S.-M.)
3.85ff.: 2
3.85-98: 84-86
10.35-55: 84-85
10.51-52: 44 n. 30
10.53: 79 n. 108
14.1-22: 84
19: 81-84
fr. 21: 55 n. 55
Baton (ed. Edmonds, FAC)
fr. 7 (= Stob. 6.29): 107 n. 180
Baudelaire
"Le Voyage I": x
Bible
Old Testament
Job 28.1-12: 113 n. 199
Psalm 20.7: 63 n. 72
Proverbs 30.21-23: 1
Jeremiah 9. 23-24: 113 n. 199
New Testament
I Corinth. 13.1-13: 113 n. 199
Apocrypha
I Esdras 4.34-41: 5 n. 17
Boethius, *Cons. Phil.*
metron 5.5: 160
Byron, *Don Juan*
I 122-127: 7 n. 23, 119 n. 10

Callimachus (ed. Pfeiffer)
Aetia
2.43.12-17: 104 n. 167
3.75.44-49: 4 n. 15, 104 n. 167
Epigrams
28: 109
h. Art.
119-122: 102 n. 164
h. Apol.
31: 47 n. 38
69-71: 102
h. Delos
1ff.: 102-104
4: 47 n. 38
28-30: 99
29: 51 n. 47
30: 48 n. 39
273: 102 n. 163
h. Zeus
1-10: 99
4ff.: 43 n. 27
6-9: 44 n. 30
66ff.: 100-101
70-88: 102
91ff.: 99 n. 160
Iamb.
12.58-68: 100 n. 161
Cato, *De Agri Cult.*
proem: 114 n. 1
Catonis Disticha (ed. Duff)
2.1-8: 23-24
Catullus
5.4-7: 106 n. 174
7: 115
7.3-10: 142 n. 50
11.1-16: 115-116, 127 n. 26
11.15: 15 n. 45
26: 116
61.199-203: 115
Chaucer, CT
Prologue 1ff.: 110 n. 191
Claudian (ed. Platnauer)
In Ruf.
1.283-296: 158-159
PO
169-173: 119 n. 11
Carm. xxvii
Praefat. 1-12: 157-158

Carm. min.
17.43-44: 117 n. 8
30.12-33: 159
30.166-185: 159
Critias
2W: 72-73
8D (= Athen. 13.600DE): 28 n. 70, 110

Demosthenes
18.5: 112 n. 194
18.129-130: 53 n. 50, 53 n. 52, 112, n. 195
18.179: 24
18.291: 112
23.82: 112 n. 194
24.34: 112 n. 194
60.25: 112 n. 194
61.27: 112 n. 194
Dio Chrysostom
44.6: 113 n. 199
Diphilus, *Parasite* (ed. Kock)
ii 561: 107 n. 180
Doctrinae Commendat. P.L. [Migne] 171, 1684
no. 49: 146 n. 56

Eucheria, *Anth. Lat.* I i 303
no. 390: 157 n. 75
Euripides
Alcestis
747-750: 98, 114
Bacchae
13-20: 50 n. 46
902-911: 3 n. 11, 98 n. 158, 118 n. 10
Electra
163-167: 98 n. 158
175-182: 98 n. 158
Hecuba
623-628: 95 n. 158
864-869: 98 n. 158
Helen
375-385: 98 n. 158
397-400: 98 n. 158
Herculus Furens
642-648: 97
Hippolytus
916-920: 98 n. 158
Ion
485-491: 97
Medea
376-385: 95-96
469-472: 96
542-544: 4 n. 15, 96-97
1415-1419: 97-98
Rhesus
106-108: 41 n. 21
497-500: 98 n. 158
Sthenoboea (ed. Page, LP, p. 126)
1-6: 98
Supplices
234-246: 98 n. 158
1118-1122: 98 n. 158
Fragmenta (ed. Nauck[2])
282.1-2: 17, 98 n. 158
316: 98 n. 158
659: 97, 111 n. 193
660 (= 659): 4 n. 16
1059: 90 n. 134

Gregory Naz., *Ad Animam Suam*
84ff.: 56 n. 58
Gregory Nyss., *Epis.*
20.2ff.: 81 n. 110, 113 n. 199

Hegesippus, *Brothers* (ed. Kock)
ii 312: 107 n. 180
Hermippus (ed. Kock)
i 249: 73
Hermogenes, *Progymn.* (ed. Rabe)
p. 8: 29
Herodotus
1.1-5: 44 n. 29, 45 n. 32, 111
8.144.1: 4 n. 15, 113 n. 199
9.69: 12 n. 35
Herondas
1.26-32: 106 n. 176
Hesiod
Opera et Dies
202: 85 n. 127
293-297: 43 n. 24
435-436: 9 n. 27, 43 n. 26
637-638: 39 n. 18, 43 n. 26
641-642: 43 n. 26
689-694: 43 n. 24
Scutum
260: 26 n. 66
393-401: 49 n. 43
Theogony
11-21: 25
79: 26 n. 66
137: 26 n. 66
231: 26 n. 66
349ff.: 26

Fragmenta (ed. M.-W.)
304: 43
Homer
Iliad
1.260-273: 39 n. 16
2.272-274: 32
2.274: 15 n. 47
2.400-403: 11 n. 31, 33 n. 5, 43 n. 23
2.760-770: 42 n. 22
3.442-446: 36 n. 11
4.163-165: 35
5.382ff.: 6 n. 21, 38, 41, 94
6.450-455: 35, 42, 105 n. 169
9.379-391: x, 4 n. 14, 28-29, 37-38, 41, 58, 67, 116
9.406-409: x, 39, 87 n. 128
9.588: 50 n. 44
10.278-280: 32 n. 2
13.726-735: 4 n. 16, 40-41
13.636-639: 32-33
14.315-328: 19, 28-29, 36, 105 n. 169
14.394-401: 27, 35, 43 n. 23, 105 n. 169
16.751-771: 27
18.483-489: 66 n. 79
22.158-161: 39-40, 42, 43 n. 23, 106 n. 175
22.162-166: 42
23.315-318: 39, 41, 54, 146
Odyssey
4.104: 32 n. 3
4.240-243: 33-34
4.266-270: 34 n. 6
5.118-129: 38, 41
5.432-435: 49 n. 43
7.241-243: 34 n. 6
8.167-177: 40-41
11.285-287: 25
11.416-420: 31-32
11.517-522: 34
12.341-342: 32
14.222-228: 4 n. 15, 39 n. 18, 66 n. 78, 56 n. 59
22.61-64: 37, 116
23.233-240: 49 n. 43
24.87-92: 31, 41
Homeric Hymns
1.1-9: 43-45, 47 n. 38, 48, 53 n. 52, 63, 81, 99, 111
2.6-8: 46
2.109-110: 26
2.425-428: 46-47
2.429: 102 n. 163
3.1ff.: 8, 44 n. 28, 83, 102
3.19ff.: 2, 47-49, 53, 99, 106
3.19: 103, 115 n. 4
3.21-24: 66 n. 79
3.25ff.: 43 n. 27
3.30-49: 21 n. 59, 49-50, 53, 81
3.140-146: 2
3.140-152: 50-53
3.146: 15 n. 46
3.149-157: 54
3.153-157: 52
3.177-178: 52 n. 49
3.207ff.: 20-21, 48, 52-53, 91 n. 137, 106
3.207: 103, 115 n. 4
3.216-282: 50, 53
3.409-438: 50, 53
5.68ff.: 45-46
Batrach.
178-185: 34 n. 6
Certamen Hom. et Hes.
265-270: 110
Epigrams
V: 16
XIII: 110
Horace
Carmina
1.1: x, 4 n. 16, 5, 124, 130
1.1.3ff.: ix, 25, 122-123, 152
1.7: 4 n. 16, 5-6, 81
1.7.1-14: 126-128, 153
1.7.15-21: 125 n. 19
1.12: 123
1.12.1: 115 n. 4
1.16.5-9: 124
1.20: 127 n. 25
1.24.9-10: 126
1.28.15-22: 124-125
1.31: 4 n. 16, 5, 21, 128-129, 154
1.31.1: 115 n. 4
1.31.3-16: 131
1.31.5-20: 80 n. 109
1.36.5-7: 126
2.6.1-4: 116 n. 6
2.6.1-8: 6 n. 22
2.6.1-14: 127
2.9: 125-126
2.16.33-40: 131
2.18: 4 n. 16
2.18.1-9: 127

2.18.1-14: 131
3.1: 4 n. 16, 5
3.11.13-32: 123
3.19.18: 152 n. 68
4.3: 4 n. 16
4.3.1-12: 6 n. 22, 127-128
Epodes
2.49: 152 n. 68
Sermones
1.2.114-119: 126 n. 20
1.6.58-60: 124
1.9.31-33: 124
2.1.24-28: 124
2.1.47-59: 124 n. 14
Epistulae
1.2.64-68: 125
1.2.67: 15 n. 45
1.7.44-45: 126 n. 22
1.8.4-7: 124
1.14.35: 152 n. 68
2.1.1ff.: 123
2.1.114-117: 124 n. 14
A.P.
63-69: 124
379-382: 124 n. 14
453-455: 124 n. 14
Hyperides, *Epitaph.*
6-9: 53 n. 50

Ibycus (ed. Diehl)
3: 21 n. 60, 156 n. 73
3.46: 53 n. 52
Isidorus, *Hymns* (ed. Vanderlip)
1.14-24: 102 n. 163
Isocrates
ad Dem.
6-7: 112
Antid.
45-46: 112 n. 195
Archid.
42: 112 n. 194
Evag.
4: 112
Panath.
1ff.: 112
Paneg.
61: 112 n. 194
114: 112 n. 194
Epis.
4.2-3: 112

Jonson, Ben
"Helen, did Homer never see ...": 136 n. 43
Juvenal, *Sat.*
10.8-13: 156
10.227-233: 156

Keats, John
"On first looking into Chapman's Homer": 21 n. 59, 50 n. 45

Libanius, *decl.*
30.31: 113 n. 199
Longus
1.14: 104 n. 168
Lucan, *Phars.*
1.89-92: 149 n. 63
1.93-95: 149 n. 63
4.378-381: 149 n. 63
10.17-20: 149 n. 63
10.474-478: 149 n. 63
Lucretius, *De Rerum Nat.*
1.726-730: 116-117
1.729: 15 n. 47
2.1ff.: xi, 7 n. 23, 19, 27, 118
3.1024-1052: 117-118
4.962-970: 157-158
5.1-6: 100 n. 160
6.1-5: 117
Lyr. Gr. Frag. Adesp. (ed. Bergk)
138: 86
Lysias, *Orat.*
3.1: 112 n. 194
19.45ff.: 6 n. 21

Macrobius, *Saturnalia*
1.1: 160
3.16.1: 114 n. 3
Manilius, *Astronomica*
3.5-31: 156 n. 73
Martial
lib. spect.
1: 110 n. 190, 153
1.7-8: 140 n. 47
28.11-12: 153 n. 71
Epigrammata
1.39.8: 155 n. 72
1.43: 154
1.61: 155
1.104: 155 n. 72
2.2.1-3: 155 n. 72
2.7.8: 155 n. 72
3.20.21: 155 n. 72
3.26: 154-155
3.72.8: 155 n. 72
4.4.1-12: 155 n. 72

4.55.1-11: 153-154
6.4.5: 155 n. 72
6.34: 115 n. 5
8.81.1-4: 154-155
9.22.16: 155 n. 72
9.57.1-13: 155 n. 72
10.2.9-12: 155
10.4.1-10: 155-156
10.4.9-10: 21
10.74: 154-155
10.87.8-20: 155
11.8.1-12: 155 n. 72
12.65.8: 155 n. 72

Maximianus, *Elegies* (ed. Bährens)
1.269-274: 30

Menander
Dysc.
666-669: 114 n. 3
Peric.
276ff.: 112 n. 194
Fragmenta (ed. Kock)
223: 107 n. 178
539: 107
540: 107
656 (Koerte): 18-23, 35 n. 9, 64 n. 75, 107, 113 n. 198, 114
668: 107 n. 179

Menander Rhetor (ed. Spengel)
3.368ff.: 22
3.376-377: 101 n. 162
3.438.11-27: 53 n. 50
3.439.25ff.: 43 n. 27

Mimnermus (ed. West)
2: 71, 107 n. 179

Nemesianus
Eclog.
4.26-30: 157 n. 74
Cyneg.
15-49: 157

Neruda, Pablo
"El Miedo": x

Ovid
Amores
1.1: 130
1.3.21-26: 141 n. 49
1.9: 130
1.10.1-9: 144
1.10.25-29: 143
1.10.37-42: 143
2.1.29-34: 145
2.4.9-48: 144
2.4.47-48: 148 n. 60
2.6.33-38: 142
2.10.31-36: 145
2.17.14-24: 69 n. 85, 143-144
2.17.31-34: 142 n. 50
3.2.43-57: 145 n. 54
3.15.7-8: 136 n. 43
Ars Amatoria
1.1-60: 146-147
1.3-4: 39 n. 16
1.45-50: 38 n. 15
1.271-273: 142
1.723-729: 143 n. 52
2.373-377: 143
2.517-519: 16 n. 50
2.735-738: 145 n. 54
3.121-127: 142-143
3.149-151: 142 n. 50
3.249-250: 142
3.251-256: 142
Ex Ponto
1.3.19-26: 141 n. 49
1.4.11-20: 141 n. 49
1.5.35-41: 95
1.6.27-44: 141 n. 49
1.6.51-53: 142 n. 50
2.3.41-48: 141 n. 49
2.4.25-29: 142 n. 50
2.5.59-64: 141 n. 49
2.7.7-16: 95 n. 150
3.1.51-56: 141 n. 49
2.5.59-64: 95 n. 150
3.2.9-16: 141 n. 49
3.3.41-46: 33 n. 4, 144 n. 53
4.1.28-36: 95 n. 150
4.10.1-8: 145 n. 55
4.3.35-58: 141
4.5.41-44: 142 n. 50
4.6.45-50: 142 n. 50
4.4.1-10: 145 n. 55
4.12.33-37: 142 n. 50
Fasti
3.713-726: 53 n. 50
Heroides
1.17-22: 144 n. 53
4.77-84: 144 n. 53
17.193-196: 141 n. 49
Ibis
31-39: 142 n. 50
199-204: 142 n. 50
637-638: 144 n. 53
Metamorphoses
13.324-327: 142 n. 50

14.37-39: 142 n. 50
Remedia Amoris
441-452: 69 n. 85, 95 n. 150
453-462: 144 n. 53
Tristia
1.1.75-81: 141 n. 49
1.2.5-12: 145 n. 55
1.8: 2
1.8.1-10: 142 n. 50
2.266-276: 69 n. 85, 145 n. 55
2.495-496: 144 n. 53
4.1.5-19: 141 n. 49
4.1.55-56: 16 n. 50
4.1.57-59: 142 n. 50
4.6: 2
4.6.1-18: 145
4.6.29-38: 95 n. 150, 141 n. 49
4.7.11-20: 142 n. 50
4.8.17-24: 141 n. 49
5.1.31-34: 142 n. 50
5.2: 2
5.2.23-27: 142 n. 50
5.5.51-60: 145 n. 55
5.6.37-41: 142 n. 50
5.12.21-30: 95 n. 150, 141 n. 49
5.13.21-23: 142 n. 50

Persius, *Satires*
1.114-119: 151-152
1.123-125: 152
5.52-62: 152
Petronius
Satyricon
83.10.1-6: 148
83.10.5: 62 n. 68, 105
137.9.1-10: 148
Fragmenta (ed. Mueller)
26: 148 n. 59
30 (Buecheler): 148 n. 59, 158 n. 76
32: 148 n. 59
Pherecrates (ed. Kock)
fr. 145 (i 188): 86, 107 n. 180
Phocylides (ed. Edmonds)
3: 71-72
Ps.-Phocylides (ed. Diehl)
201-203: 69
Phoenix of Colophon (ed. Powell)
1.3-9: 107
Pindar (ed. S.-M.)
Olympian Odes
1.1ff.: x, 2, 5 n. 18, 15 n. 48, 75-76, 81, 84 n. 125, 118 n. 9
1.3: 15 n. 43
1.3-7: 14 n. 40
1.5: 37 n. 12
1.113-114: 74-76
1.114: 37 n. 12
1.116: 75 n. 103
2.1ff.: 81, 123
2.1: 115 n. 4
2.85: 85 n. 127
2.86: 96 n. 153
3.42-45: 73 n. 98, 74-75
6.1ff.: 10
7.1ff.: 10
7.11-13: 77, 78 n. 107
8.12-18: 77-78
9.100: 96 n. 153
9.104-108: 78 n. 106
10 *fin.*: 10
11.1ff.: 2, 5, 11-15, 76, 79, 81 n. 111
12.1ff.: 5, 66 n. 79, 81, 91 n. 139
13.93-97: 78 n. 106
14.1ff.: 5, 66 n. 79, 81
Pythian Odes
1.75-80: 2, 80
1.99-100: 2, 79 n. 108
2.13ff.: 2, 12 n. 36, 78
3: 79 n. 108
10.4: 44 n. 30
10.59-64: 78 n. 106
11.42-44: 77
Nemean Odes
1.25-26: 96 n. 153
1.25-30: 78 n. 106
3.6-8: 10-15, 79 n. 108
4.1-6: 10, 79 n. 108
4.89ff.: 73-74
6.1ff.: 81 n. 111
7.1ff.: 5, 66 n. 79, 81
7.5: 81 n. 112
7.6: 81 n. 112
7.14-16: 79 n. 108
8.1ff.: 5, 66 n. 79, 81
8.3: 81 n. 112
8.37-39: 4 n. 16, 78-80, 129 n. 29
8.42-44: 78-79
10.1ff.: 81
10.3: 81 n. 112
10.5: 81 n. 112
10.5-18: 81 n. 113

Isthmian Odes
1.47-51: 11-15, 66 n. 79, 79 n. 108, 91 n. 137
4.5ff.: 78 n. 106, 78 n. 107
5.1ff.: 5, 66 n. 79, 81, 91 n. 139
5.3: 81 n. 112
5.10: 68 n. 83
5.30-35: 2, 80
5.52-54: 78 n. 106
7.1ff.: ix, 32 n. 2, 48 n. 39, 64 n. 75, 66 n. 79, 81, 91 n. 137
7.1: 115 n. 4
Fragmenta
29: 48 n. 39, 81
106: 72
128c: 81 n. 111, 81 n. 113
221: 4 n. 16, 123 n. 13
Plato
Apology
36d: 61 n. 66
Gorgias
448c: 113
Laws
660e-661c5: 4 n. 14, 57 n. 60, 112
661a4: 4
Lysis
211d-e: 80 n. 109, 112
211e: 111 n. 193
Menexenus
241a: 112 n. 194
Phaedrus
240a9-b7: 113
259d: 26 n. 68
264d: 110 n. 188
Symposium
221c-d: 112-113
Timaeus
24d: 112 n. 194
Plautus
Capt.
461-463: 114
998ff.: 112 n. 194, 114
Cas.
759-762: 114
Men.
446-448: 114 n. 3
Mil.
1284-1291: 114-115
Most.
775-777: 114
Pers.
1-5: 114
470-471: 114 n. 3
778-779: 114
Ps.
415-417: 114 n. 3
905-907: 114 n. 3
Rud.
593-596: 114 n. 3
1281-1282: 114 n. 3
Stich.
274-275: 114 n. 3
Tri.
1115-1116: 114 n. 3
Truc.
699-700: 114 n. 3
Plutarch, *de Tranquil. An.*
470B: 56 n. 58
Ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. Hom.* (ed. Allen)
87-94: 45
Polybius
6.10.3-4: 107 n. 180
Priapea (ed. Buecheler)
11: 115 n. 4
36: 109 n. 185
61: 115 n. 4
Propertius
1.2.8: 132 n. 34
1.3.1-8: 27, 133 n. 35
1.4.5-8: 135 n. 40
1.6.1-4: 116 n. 6
1.8B.39-40: 133
1.9.19-22: 133 n. 36
1.12.15-20: 133-134
1.13.13-14: 132
1.14: 137-138
1.15.9-24: 135, 136 n. 43
1.15.29-31: 134 n. 38
1.16.29-32: 133 n. 36
1.19.1-4: 133 n. 36
1.19.13-16: 133 n. 36
2.1-78: 138-139
2.1.1-4: 132, 134 n. 39, 147
2.1.1-16: 144
2.1.15-16: 148 n. 60
2.1.43-46: 66 n. 78
2.1.57-58: 33 n. 4
2.2.13: 140 n. 47
2.3.5-8: 133 n. 36, 134 n. 38
2.3.9-17: 35 n. 10
2.3.9-22: 135 n. 42
2.5.21-28: 135-136
2.5.25: 111 n. 193
2.8.7-12: 135 n. 41
2.9.3-20: 135

2.9.33-36: 133 n. 36
2.13.5-8: 133 n. 36
2.13.9-12: 133
2.13.17-26: 136
2.13.25ff.: 137 n. 44
2.14.1-10: 133 n. 35
2.15.31-36: 134
2.16.51-54: 133 n. 36
2.17.5-10: 134 n. 38
2.22.15-18: 134-135
2.25.5-10: 134
2.30.3-8: 134 n. 38
2.32.49-52: 133 n. 36
2.34.15-18: 133 n. 36
2.34.27-32: 137 n. 44
2.34.65: 140 n. 47
2.34.85-94: 6 n. 22, 136
3.2.1ff.: 139-140
3.2.9ff.: 137 n. 44
3.3.41-48: 137
3.4: 130
3.5: 130
3.9.7: 132 n. 34
3.9.7-22: 95 n. 150, 136
3.9.35-44: 136-137
3.11.5-8: 133 n. 36
3.11.61-70: 136 n. 43
3.19.5-10: 134 n. 38
3.22.1ff.: 140
4.4.39-44: 132 n. 33

Quintilian
8.3.61: 19
8.3.72: 19
8.4.3-6: 58 n. 63
9.2.19: 20
9.3.54-57: 24

Rhet. ad Herennium
1.11: 22
4.59: 18 n. 53
4.62: 18 n. 53

Sappho (ed. L.-P.)
1.5: 32 n. 2
16: x, 2, 4, 15 n. 48, 44 n. 29, 45 n. 32, 56 n. 59, 63-64, 74 n. 100, 80 n. 109, 91 n. 137, 108, 111, 122-123, 126 n. 22
104(a)2: 64 n. 75
115: 64 n. 75
Semonides (ed. West)
1: 71, 107 n. 179
7: 71-72

Seneca
Aga.
15-27: 150-151
H.F.
192-197: 150
838-849: 149
Hipp.
540-559: 150
568-573: 149 n. 65
H.O.
335-338: 149 n. 65
558-562: 32 n. 2, 149-150
658-670: 150
1166-1173: 93 n. 142
1576-1580: 149
1582-1586: 149
Med.
401-407: 149 n. 64
Oed.
503-508: 149 n. 64
600-607: 149
Thy.
290-294: 151
455-469: 150 n. 66
Epis.
36.7-8: 149
50.6: 149
Dubia
Oct. 222-226: 149 n. 65
Oct. 740-742: 158 n. 76
A.L. (ed. Reise) I i p. 331, no. 440: 119 n. 11
Shakespeare
Sonnet 91: x, 53 n. 52, 111 n. 193
Solon (ed. West)
9: 6, 64-65
13.43ff.: 65-67, 84, 91 n. 137
13.63ff.: 137 n. 44
Sophocles
Ajax
1ff.: 91 n. 135
646-650: 94
669-676: 6 n. 21, 94-95
Antigone
332: xi, 2, 8 n. 24, 13-17, 20, 89 n. 132, 92, 93 n. 144, 117, 160
Ichneutae (ed. Page, LP, p. 30)
13ff.: 50 n. 46
Philoctetes
1047-1048: 112 n. 194
Trachiniae
153-154: 35 n. 8, 112 n. 194

497-506: 90-91
503-504: 87 n. 129
1046-1052: 92
1048: 93 n. 144
1058-1063: 92-93
1089-1106: 93
Statius, *Silvae*
2.6.1-10: 153 n. 69
3.3.79-84: 153 n. 69
Synesius, *Hymns*
9.1-44: 4 n. 16

Terence
And.
254-259: 114 n. 3
855-859: 114 n. 3
Hec.
198-204: 114 n. 3
281-282: 114 n. 3
Theocritean Corpus (ed. Gow)
1.132-136: 29
7.91-94: 105-106
7.149-153: 105 n. 169
8.53-56: 4 n. 15, 68 n. 83, 80 n. 109, 97 n. 155, 104 n. 168
8.57-59: 104 n. 168
8.79-80: 104 n. 168
9.7-8: 104 n. 168
9.31-35: 104 n. 168
10.30-31: 104-105, 119
11.10-11: 104 n. 168
16.60-63: 105 n. 169
17.11-13: 106
17.53-57: 106
17.77-79: 105 n. 171
17.104-105: 101 n. 162
18.26-28: 106
18.29-31: 106
20.34-42: 33 n. 4, 62 n. 68, 105
20.42-45: 93 n. 142
23.28-32: 106
Moschus
2.63-71: 47 n. 36
2.69: 102 n. 163
3.37-44: 105 n. 169
3.99-105: 106
Theognis (ed. West)
183-188: 33 n. 4, 62 n. 68-69, 105 n. 170, 143 n. 51
255-256: 5, 71 n. 90
537-538: 70
699ff.: 4, 19 n. 54, 28-29, 62 n. 68, 67-69
783-788: ix, 19 n. 54, 21 n. 59, 50 n. 45, 70, 81
1103-1104: 69-70
Thucydides
1.86.3: 4 n. 16, 113 n. 199
3.37.1: 112 n. 194
Tibullan Corpus (ed. Postgate)
1.1-6: 4 n. 16, 80 n. 109, 130, 145
1.1.41-44: 131 n. 32
1.153ff.: 5
1.2.67-74: 131 n. 32
1.4.65-66: 16 n. 50
1.7.13-23: 49 n. 42
1.8.1-6: 131-132, 147
1.9.7-11: 131
1.9.31ff.: 5
2.3.35-48: 131
2.3.47: 15 n. 45
2.4.16-19: 132 n. 32
2.6.20-28: 132 n. 32
3.3.3-8: 130-131
3.4.85-94: 131 n. 32
3.7.8-16: 132 n. 32
Timocreon (ed. Diehl)
1: 4 n. 16, 106
Timotheus, *Persians* (ed. Page, PMG)
221-229: 86
de Tocqueville, *De la Démocratie en Amérique Intro.*: 160 n. 80
Tyrtaeus (ed. West)
12 (= 9D): 2, 4, 6, 20 n. 56, 28-29, 38 n. 14, 57-59, 61, 66-68, 97 n. 155

Vergilian Corpus
Eclogues
1.59-63: 119 n. 11
2.63-65: 24, 119
3.80-81: 119
3.82-83: 119
5.32-34: 119
5.76-78: 16 n. 50, 28, 119
7.61-68: 119
Georgics
2.109-176: 120-121, 140
2.140-144: 140 n. 48
2.170: 15 n. 46
2.490: 133
2.503-513: 120
3.3-9: 156 n. 73
Aeneid
1.607-610: 43 n. 23, 120

6.847-853: xi, 43 n. 23, 121
6.851: 15 n. 45
7.54-56: 121 n. 12
12.764-765: 40 n. 19
Catal.
9.39-40: 119
Culex
26-36: 119

Villon, François
"Ballade des femmes de Paris": x
"Je congnois bien ...": 109 n. 185

Xenophanes (ed. West)
2: 4, 38 n. 14, 59-62, 63 n. 72, 67-68, 105 n. 170

ISBN 90 04 06515 6